

SPRINGFIELD CITY HALL * LIBRARY MEETING ROOM * 225 FIFTH STREET * 541-726-3753

Wednesday

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
June 30, 2010

6:00 p.m.

STAFF PRESENT: Bill Grile, Gary Karp, Kristi Krueger, Molly Markarian, Clayton McEachern, Greg Mott, Linda Pauly, John Tamulonis, George Walker.

CAC MEMBERS PRESENT: Susan Ban, Bill Seider, Roxi Thoren, Christine Kehoe, Eric Howard, Bill Woods, Randy Hledik, John Oldham, Steve Roth, Zack Pardo, Steve Ramseur, Ken Schmidt.

PUBLIC ATTENDING: Tim Shinaberger, Ali McQueen, Michael LeClere, Pam Seaver, Joany Armstead.

- **CALL TO ORDER –**

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT –**

There was no public comment.

- **MINUTES –**

The minutes from the last CAC meeting have not been completed, so approval was postponed.

- **LAND USE CHAPTER–**

PROCESS OVERVIEW

- ***Purpose of Meeting***

Molly explained that the purpose of the evening's CAC meeting is to: orient the Committee with the proposed location and size of discernable plan designations and zoning areas; to describe the intended uses for these areas (what would be permitted and expected and reasons why); and to present the key points from the Draft Land Use Chapter. Molly clarified that the actual written draft is undergoing revisions and will be made available prior to the August CAC meeting. She stated that the revisions are principally around issues of style, so no substantive changes will be made to the recommendations.

- ***Expectation of CAC for Meeting***

Molly described what the staff is looking for from the CAC from this meeting. She said that an endorsement from the CAC to move ahead with a land use scheme is necessary at this time because of the need to fit other Chapters/issues to the land use scheme to keep the project moving forward. Molly went on to say that the staff wants to know from the CAC whether the proposal she will describe: includes the correct uses in the correct configuration within the correct boundaries; and matches the vision in terms of location, mix, and type of essential uses.

- ***Review of Decision-Making Process***

Molly reminded the CAC of the process the CAC had agreed to in their Operating Agreement for discussions and decisions. She referred to pages 3-4 of the Operating Agreement and reviewed the process. First, a proposal will be presented and an opportunity will be provided for clarifying questions and discussion. Then, the co-chairs will decide at what point the discussion has moved along enough to call for a consensus vote. It is up to Roxi and Steve to say that there has been

enough discussion and to see if there is enough consensus, so at that time staff will ask for everyone to hold up their hand displaying 1 to 5 fingers or a fist. If everyone puts up 1 to 5 fingers, then what staff is recommending will move forward to the Planning Commission. If two or more CAC members display 1 or 2 fingers, then there needs to be more discussion. If anyone puts up a fist (block) then more discussion will occur.

Molly then reviewed what the fingers indicate:

- 5 is strong support;
- 4 is support;
- 3 is willing to approve without further discussion;
- 2 is you really think more discussion needs to be had on minor issues;
- 1 is you have major concerns and want to discuss even further, or make amendments; and
- Fist (Block) is really strong opposition to what is being proposed.

Molly clarified that there will be time for people who show a fist, one, or two fingers to make their thoughts known. Molly thinks it's important to remember that if you are in the Block category, it's really up to that person to express to the Committee what their concerns are and help to work towards a resolution. Then if there are two calls for consensus and it doesn't work out, the co-chairs can decide if the Committee uses a standard majority vote.

Molly wanted to make it clear that if there are minority opinions, staff will forward those opinions onto the Planning Commission so that they get to hear everything people think even if the majority voted another way.

Bill Seider asked Molly to zip ahead to what will happen after staff gets a recommendation from the CAC. Molly responded that staff will know at that point that the CAC is comfortable with the Plan Designations, and then staff will finalize the Land Use Chapter and then email it out to the CAC so that the CAC can discuss what it thinks of the actual written Chapter in August. Molly said that the staff hope to, in the meantime, be finalizing their recommendations for circulation and for natural resources so that those topics can be brought to the Committee in August.

One of the biggest concerns Bill Seider has is that the Committee hasn't seen any of this yet. Bill has read through the strategies for consensus, which says that "members are expected to communicate with their respective interest groups." Bill represents the Chamber of Commerce, and he has not shared any of this with his respective interest group. Bill is concerned with agreeing with something that he might consider favorable, but there is a big group behind him that may not be in favor and has not seen the work. Bill wants to make sure that they get another chance to say that this group has some other concerns. Molly recommended that if this is how the Committee feels that after they have seen the presentation and discussed it and that the Committee tables their decision until the August meeting but at least the Committee's current thoughts can be noted at this time. Molly reminded the Committee that if the Committee agrees to table their recommendation until August, they should know that what is currently planned for August will shift accordingly.

- ***Factors Shaping Recommendations***

Molly described the factors that shaped the staff's recommendations. The first is all the visioning and goal setting that was done by the committee at the beginning of the planning process. Staff also considered the recommendations that Crandall Arambula made to staff and the committee, as well as the committee's discussions with Crandall Arambula, including the oral and written feedback that was provided to Crandall Arambula. Staff also took into consideration the discussion that the Committee had last month regarding thoughts on land uses for the McVay Corridor. Staff also took into consideration public comments that staff has received over the last year, especially from developers and potential developers. Then staff took input from the rest of the City project staff and the Technical Advisory Group. Staff also thought about prior Council direction, as well as issues such as property dimensions, nearby uses, proximity to amenities and infrastructure, natural and

manmade opportunities and constraints, the citywide land needs from the Buildable Lands Inventory, and coordinating this project with what is being planned for Downtown.

One caveat that Molly wanted to make was that while the plan designation map does show the street grid that Crandall Arambula recommended, the Committee tonight will not be talking about staff's recommendation regarding the circulation network, but staff wanted to put it on the map for reference. Staff also feels that the North/South streets on the grid help provide a good delineation between various sub-areas and the staff feels that the North/South streets are sort of a given if they are going to connect logically with what is to the South in terms of McVay Highway and Mississippi, Henderson and Glenwood Boulevard. Staff looked at making the plan designation divisions along property lines, but it just didn't seem as logical as future streets.

LAND USE CONTEXT

Molly introduced the next topic and started by reminding the Committee that they could interrupt at anytime and ask questions, but that in some cases, it may make sense to hold some questions until the end of the presentation. Molly started by talking about what is discussed in the draft Land Use Chapter; some of the land use context items that are discussed are as follows:

- Willamette River

Molly reminded the Committee that they have all said that the Willamette River is a very important factor in future land use in Glenwood. She added that staff's recommendations in terms of natural resource protection include measures to enhance and conserve water quality and the habitat, but the arrangement of the land uses and the streets and the open space, as well as the building form and height standards related to that, which staff have not brought to the committee yet, are intended to promote the development of physical public access for a wide variety of people to the river, and also to protect views.

- Neighborhood Design

Molly mentioned that another context piece is the neighborhood design pattern, so the arrangement of houses where people live, work places, and shops support behaviors that ultimately affect the environment and the quality of life. She added that the whole mixed use concept, mixing some complementary uses with an interconnected and walkable street network and open spaces, was talked about and thought about a lot, because the committee and staff have said that they feel that a mix of uses encourages a more lively and interesting, pedestrian-friendly, and safer place for people to meet, work, and shop both day and night. A mix of uses also tends to make infrastructure, especially transportation infrastructure, more efficient and encourages walking, biking and use of transit if transit is in close proximity, and there are also some health, environmental, and social benefits to mixing of uses.

- Nodal Development

Molly stated that in the Eugene-Springfield area, the mixed use concept is often referred to as a node. Staff will be referring to this in the future and that is because in this area nodes were a way that the cities tried to meet some of the Transportation planning goal regulations regarding reduction in vehicle miles traveled. One of the sites that was identified in 2002 in the Regional Transportation Plan as a future node is the Glenwood riverfront.

- Sustainability

Molly added that another piece of context that the Chapter talks about is sustainability. Several of the committee members, neighborhood residents, and potential developers alike have talked about neighborhood sustainability and have brought up the LEED neighborhood design program, which is a national tool developed with a series of performance measures that developments can apply for and get certified. Staff is not proposing that LEED be required of any development in Glenwood, but staff has set up the Land use Chapter to talk about how development in Glenwood generally meets many of the performance measures of LEED, and also ways that the policies that are

proposed encourage sustainable development. The Chapter also talks about encouraging design teams for future development in Glenwood to include a green building professional, and it also talks about the possibility of the City Council and SEDA considering a policy such that development receiving support from the City or its Urban Renewal Agency be required to meet, or be able to meet, certain LEED benchmarks.

LAND USE FRAMEWORK

Phase I

- **North Riverfront Corridor**
- **East Riverfront Corridor**

Molly reminded the Committee that tonight's discussion is for only Phase I of the Refinement Plan, which for many months staff has been referring to as the North Riverfront Corridor and the East Riverfront Corridor. Molly said that she wanted to take this opportunity to make sure that the committee is still comfortable with staff identifying these areas as the North Riverfront Corridor and the East Riverfront Corridor and if the committee has any feedback now on this, it would be much appreciated by staff.

Molly went on to say that staff feels that the land use framework that they are proposing establishes a mix of commercial, office, and industrial uses that support the creation of family wage jobs and visitor opportunities in close proximity to, and integrated with, a residential mixed-use area that promotes housing choice in the heart of the North Riverfront Corridor. She said that the staff also feels that the proposed land use framework compliments and enhances the Willamette Greenway principles and the Statewide Planning Goal related to Willamette Greenway, and will be integrated with public amenities that will ultimately increase overall land value in Glenwood.

- **Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District**

Molly said that one of the first major recommendations is that all of Phase I be included in what staff is calling the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District, which would be a Plan District. Plan Districts are essentially used by municipalities when citywide zoning like our Low Density Residential zoning or Medium Density Residential zoning cannot achieve the desired development objectives of the unique character of a specific place. Staff feels that Glenwood Phase I area is unique enough to have its own Plan District, so this Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District would be considered the zoning district, and it would be a section of the Springfield Development Code containing development and design standards.

Molly mentioned that Springfield has several overlay districts that typically relate to natural resource protection (not always), but some examples of overlay districts applicable in Glenwood are the Willamette Greenway Overlay District, Floodplain Overlay District, and Hillside Overlay District. These overlay districts will continue to apply in the Phase I area.

Molly said that staff is proposing that the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District supersede the existing Riverfront Plan District. The reason for this is that when Council directed staff to work on this project the directive was to comprehensively update the Glenwood Refinement Plan. She added that the assumption was that staff would take the policy direction in the Glenwood Riverfront Specific Area Plan and the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District as kind of a starting point but, there are several factors that exist today that were not in play when that plan was worked on. One is the Franklin Boulevard Corridor Study that has occurred since then; infrastructure planning, especially around wastewater that has occurred since then; a major bridge is being replaced to the west end of Glenwood, the Willamette River Bridge; there is a process that is underway to redesign the interchange at Glenwood Boulevard; there has also been significant business relocations like Williams Bakery (US Bakery); and the Urban Renewal District.

Molly told the Committee that the City is building upon those prior efforts but sees this as an opportunity to take a more comprehensive look at the desired type and form of development, so that's why staff is proposing that when the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District is adopted, by Council and the Board of Commissioners that it will ultimately replace the existing Riverfront Plan District.

Molly explained that the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District will establish permitted uses which will conform to what is discussed in the Plan Designation. The District will identify primary and secondary uses that address distinct opportunities and constraints in four sub-areas. Staff is proposing that all parcels be rezoned to the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District and that they be re-designated as Molly would later explain in the four (4) sub-areas.

- **Non-Conforming Situations**

Molly stated that when land is re-zoned and re-designated, non-conforming situations for existing uses sometimes occur. The Springfield Development Code currently has a section that is dedicated to what happens to pre-existing non-conforming uses, and she said that that all buildings and structures can continue, expand, and be modified as per those regulations.

- **Use Lists**

Molly said that for those familiar with the Development Code, Springfield's has in every zoning district an extensive use list, pages and pages of every potential use that can be allowed. Staff is proposing to get away from that because there are uses that emerge due to technology or changes over time that are not on the list, things that staff have not conceived of. Staff is proposing to have categories of uses that are defined with examples and then when a development wants to come into the City then it's up to the Director in writing the staff report to make findings that the proposed use meets the definition of a category and will not have a greater impact than the uses that are shown as examples. Molly added that the City also has a Formal Interpretation process should the Director not be able to say yes, this proposed use clearly meets the definition of, for example, retail. Molly explained that she will be going through what the City is proposing in definitions and examples for the various uses in the Phase I area.

Roxi Thoren asked a question regarding pre-existing non conforming uses; Roxi wanted to make sure she understands it correctly. If there is a cow farm and the cow farm is no longer an acceptable use, can the owner continue using the property the same way and can the owner make additions and modifications to structures based on pre-existing language? Molly asked Gary Karp to address this question. Gary responded that there is a process in the Springfield Development Code that helps property owners with pre-existing non-conforming uses. Gary handed out copies of this section of the Development Code. Roxi explained that she understands the grandfathering of existing uses. Molly explained that there are thresholds for certain kinds of expansions and modifications that need to follow the Development Code regulations. For instance, Roaring Rapids can continue to be in the location that it is, and there is a certain threshold at which if the business is expanded, the expansion cannot be as close to the river as the current building because of the riparian protection measures that have been imposed at a Federal level and then adopted locally since the original building was constructed.

John Tamulonis (JT) asked if other expansions could occur, whether it was in this case one would avoid the threshold piece, for example the owner could put something behind the building. Molly responded that the structure behind the existing building would have to meet new design standards that will be adopted as part of Phase 1.

- **Residential**

- **High Density Residential (HDR)** – Molly went on to explain that the High Density Residential category includes attached dwelling units. She said that currently, the minimum density for this category is 20 dwelling units an acre, but that staff is saying that in most of the subareas of Phase I where residential is permitted that the minimum

would be 50 dwelling units per net acre. Some examples of what types of dwellings would fall into this category are: Apartments; Condominiums; Senior / Congregate Care; Lofts; and Row Housing. Molly said that this would include a development where someone can meet the 50 dwelling units an acre by having more typical multi-family style apartments or condos in upper stories but more of a Row House type design at the street level. It depends on the design and the building form.

JT offered an example of high density housing as the Royal Building in downtown is on a ¼ acre, which has 34 to 35 units, but is close to 140 units per acre with ground floor retail. The Tate is about 50 dwelling units an acre. Ken Schmidt asked how parking works with this type of development. JT responded that parking is a different issue. One example is, in Portland where the parking is inside the building, you go up a ramp and it is in the interior, so you have retail on the ground floor, the second floor is parking, and then townhouses on the top floor, which are like Row Houses along the top, with apartments on the 3rd and 4th floor, so it has a real mix of retail on the bottom floor and offices on the second floor.

Randy Hledik asked, based on the map presented to the Committee where Area A – Residential Mixed-Use, is showing, is staff proposing High Density Residential zoning in this area. Molly responded no, and will explain after she finishes going through all the uses and their definitions, so when she says, “Area A Retail”, everyone will understand what she is talking about in terms of Retail.

- **Commercial**

Molly said that staff is proposing creating five (5) categories:

- **Retail Sales & Services** – These are commercial enterprises whose principle activity involves the sale and/or servicing of merchandise, new or used, directly to consumers, Examples include grocery, florist, bookstore, etc.
- **Eating & Drinking Establishments** – These are commercial enterprises whose principle activity involves the sale or service of prepared food and beverages directly to consumers. Examples include bakeries, wine bars, coffee shops, restaurants, etc.
- **Personal Services** – There is a little overlap with retail if you have something like watch repair, watch sales, and other businesses like that, but staff feels that another use category is necessary. Personal Services are commercial enterprises whose principle activity involves the care of a person or their apparel. Examples are a fitness center, beauty salon, tailor, dry cleaner, etc.
- **Professional, Scientific, or Technical Services** – This category includes commercial office enterprises whose principle activity involves providing a specialized professional, scientific or technical service to others. These types of offices are typically smaller scale, and they can be housed in an office storefront, an office building, a residential unit, or in a live/work unit. Typically, they require a high degree of expertise, training or certifications, but not necessarily. What really distinguishes them from the office employment, which Molly will speak to in a minute, is that there is typically frequent, direct interaction between the public and the proprietor. For instance, with an insurance agent office, people go in the office and interact with the agents as they would in an architecture office. Whereas, when talking about office employment, people drive to their office, park their car, and work there all day and there is not really much interaction with the public at large.

Randy Hledik asked if a cell phone company would fit under retail. Molly responded that retail sales and service of cell phones would fit under retail but that would be up to the Director to say in which category a particular use falls.

- **Hospitality Services** – This category includes commercial enterprises whose principle activities are the provision of temporary visitor accommodations or services to the public. Examples include hotels, inns, conference hotels with meeting facilities, extended stay apartment hotels, etc.
- **Office Employment**
Molly explained that this category, which she differentiated from the Professional, Technical, or Scientific Services category of Commercial uses, includes businesses whose principle activity is associated with the performance of a range of administrative, medical, high tech, information technology, information management, and research and development functions. Examples would be call centers, corporate / regional headquarters, software development, media production, data processing services, technical support centers, physicians' clinics, etc.

Susan Ban asked why physicians' clinics are in this category and not in Professional, Technical or Scientific. Molly responded that the thinking is that this would be for a physicians' office building. Ms. Ban asked if this might include the transcriptionist and all the people that do not deal with clients. Molly responded that the list of uses in this category is typically an office building as opposed to ground floor retail space or someone's apartment.

- **Light Medium Industrial**
Molly said that this category includes businesses engaged in the production, assembly, testing, warehousing, and/or distribution functions typically with light manufacturing and technology industries in indoor facilities, typically generates freight traffic to bring goods in or ship goods out. Examples include solar panel assembly, pipe assembly, scientific laboratories, manufacture of bread, manufacture of coffee, recycling facilities, etc.

Subarea A – Residential Mixed-Use

Molly said that staff is proposing to designate Subarea A Residential Mixed-Use. Molly wants to remind everyone that this is not the Residential Mixed-Use zoning that is in the current Development Code. This is a Residential Mixed-Use designation that directs the land uses that would be in the Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use District, which is the zoning district.

This subarea contains approximately 34.1 Gross Acres. Molly reminded the Committee that at the last meeting, Tim Bingham spoke about existing riparian protections. She explained that in Subarea A, the existing riparian setback is 75 feet and that it constitutes about 8% of the subarea. In terms of the streets and parks that Crandall Arambula recommended, those would comprise approximately 24%.

Steve Ramseur said that he is concerned with roads and parks being in the same category. Molly replied that this refers to infrastructure and that the purpose of this information is to show that the proposed parks and roads do not comprise 80% of the area as some people thought when Crandall Arambula first made their recommendations. Molly added that the current Glenwood Riverfront Plan says that this type of infrastructure, streets and parks, would comprise 25-35% of that area, and this is in line with the rest of the City. Zack Pardo asked Molly if she had the approximate breakdown in the subarea that shows how much is roads and how much is parks. Molly responded that roads are approximately 13% and Parks are 10%.

Molly said Subarea A is intended for the development of an urban high-density residential mixed-use neighborhood to:

- help meet an identified deficiency in high density residential land in Springfield;

- provide additional housing choices for area residents;
- take advantage of riverfront views and unique development opportunities;
- capitalize on the proximity of a high frequency transit corridor and existing and future job centers; and
- support the high level of public investment in infrastructure that has occurred/is planned in the North Riverfront Corridor.

Molly then reviewed the key highlights of Subarea A:

- Required Primary Use: HDR @ 50 du/acre. This level of density encourages a compact, urban form.
- Typical Height: 4-6 stories, which depends on design of the development of the site.
 - Common Occupancy:
 - Multi-family apartments
 - Condominiums
 - Senior/congregate care
 - Other attached dwelling types
- Encourages variety of unit sizes – the plan Chapter text encourages developers within their buildings to develop a variety of unit sizes to enable residents from a wide range of economic levels, household sizes, and age groups to live there. The City cannot require certain size apartments, but definitely can encourage it so we can see that range.
- Full build-out: A minimum of 1,000 dwelling units – at full build-out at 50 dwelling units per acre, which would be years and years down the road, if everything gets built-out. While there would be a minimum of 1,000 dwelling units the capacity exists for more dwelling units like Crandall Arambula depicted in their presentation.

Molly added that the committee has talked in the past about the fact that livelier street edges make for safer streets and that ground floor shops and offices provide services to residents who would live above and would attract activity to the street. Therefore, limited commercial uses are encouraged in an effort to:

- Create an active street life throughout the day and evening;
- Support a pedestrian-friendly environment;
- Provide close-in commercial uses serving residents and employees in the area;
- Take advantage of riverfront sites and easy access to major transportation corridors; and
- Moderate traffic generation from the high intensity of residential uses in this subarea.

Molly clarified that the last item, “Moderate traffic generation...” means, instead of someone getting into their car and driving to the florist that might be in another part of town if there happens to be a florist in Subarea A, they would just walk or bike there.

Molly added that staff is saying that 4 out of the 5 commercial categories would be considered the secondary uses:

- Secondary Uses
 - Commercial: Retail Sales & Service
 - Commercial: Eating & Drinking Establishments
 - Commercial: Personal Services
 - Commercial: Professional, Scientific, or Technical Services
 - Auto/Truck-Oriented Uses are not intended for this area because auto oriented uses are not consistent with the intent of a pedestrian and transit oriented environment, and they also conflict with the Nodal regulations that would apply to this area.

Steve Ramseur wanted to know why there are roads right through the middle of the two parks indicated on the map. Molly responded that this is part of the whole circulation discussion, and it's about having an inter-connected grid to keeps block sizes at a certain length, so that people could walk easily. Molly

also responded that this is something that hasn't been brought to the Committee yet, but the cross section and components would be different, essentially it would be a lane to ensure passage and sidewalks. There would be no parking in those areas.

Bill Seider asked where a grocery store would fit into where the commercial sections are. Molly responded that it would be located in the retail sales. Mr. Seider asked if it would be like the Market of Choice on Franklin Boulevard or a Kiva type grocery store, and would there be a size limitation. Molly responded that at this point staff is not proposing any size limitation. Randy Hledik asked where a Starbucks would be located. Molly responded that it would be Commercial: Eating and Drinking. Mr. Hledik added that Starbucks can be auto-oriented. Molly replied that a Starbucks here wouldn't be auto-oriented because there would be no drive through allowed. Gas station and truck shops would be auto-oriented, so they couldn't be in this area either. Molly went on to say that this is all consistent with the existing Riverfront Plan District. The existing Riverfront District Plan District prohibits auto-oriented uses and that is consistent with existing nodal regulations.

Molly mentioned several other key components of the secondary uses:

- They are an integral part of primary residential development, and therefore they would have to be on the ground floor of buildings fronting public realm. The public realm is streets, parks, stormwater facilities, etc. where the public would tend to gather. Buildings fronting Franklin: Upper story commercial is allowed. Commercial can be on any floor because Franklin Boulevard has attributes that are desirable for many commercial enterprises and on the south side of the street, there will be more of a business emphasis. So you could have commercial on any floor of buildings fronting Franklin in subarea A. Developers would still have to meet the residential requirements.

Zack Pardo asked for clarification about the Riverfront Plan District and auto-oriented uses. Molly said that the auto/truck-oriented uses were not permitted currently under the Riverfront Plan District, which is a Development Code regulation that governs the development of 48 acres adopted in 2005. The regulations that are in place currently do not permit auto-oriented uses. Mr. Pardo asked if this was a City Council decision. Molly responded that yes it was a Council decision, and the County Commission also was involved.

Zack Pardo also asked if parking is an auto/truck oriented use. Molly responded that if it's a standalone parking structure completely unassociated with commercial development or residential development, it would not be allowed. But parking that serves development is considered a part of that use, just like stormwater facilities. Molly went on to say that the City has to provide parking in these areas or development will not thrive because not everyone can take the EmX, bike, or walk.

- Secondary Uses are limited because:
 - The primary use in this subarea is intended to be residential;
 - This is the only subarea where the primary use is residential;
 - By limiting the Commercial, this is the best way to preserve the high density residential land supply; and
 - This subarea is not intended to compete with the Downtown Springfield as a commercial center.

Zack Pardo asked Molly when she talks about High Density Residential if she means the definition from the Development Code, because Medium Density Residential is 10 to 20 acres per unit. Molly responded that we defined each of the use categories so that High Density Residential in the case of "A" would be a minimum of 50 dwelling units an acre, with no maximum. Height is something that hasn't been discussed yet and would regulate the maximum.

Subarea B – Commercial Mixed-Use (East of Area A)

Molly reviewed key highlights of Subarea B:

- 17.6 Gross Acres in size.
- There is a lot of river frontage and a relatively small area 15.9% riparian setback; approximately 8.6% roads.

This area is intended to provide for flexible commercial and/or urban high-density residential development opportunities, in response to developer interest in and market demand for hotels, meeting, and entertainment uses with riverfront views and access that complements the adjacent urban high-density residential mixed-use neighborhoods.

The primary uses are all of the commercial categories, including hospitality. Those commercial uses could either be a single use or part of a residential/commercial mix. Residential would also be considered a primary use at a minimum of 50 dwelling units per acre, and would not be required but would be permitted as either a stand-alone residential building or part of a commercial building.

Mr. Seider asked if he is reading this correctly as a single-use or a residential/commercial mix. Molly responded that what she is trying to say is it could be a stand-alone residential building or a building that has a residential/commercial mix of uses; a vertical mix. Mr. Seider asked if it could be a building with a mix of commercial uses. Molly responded yes and gave the example of a hotel on three floors with one floor as retail.

Subarea C – Office Mixed-Use

Molly said that this area encompasses a lot of the western half of the north side of Franklin and most of the south side of Franklin in Phase I. She added that there are 52.2 gross acres, approximately 5.3% of which are roads and 8.4% riparian setback.

Mr. Ramseur asked if the roundabout is part of the 5% of roads. Molly replied that any of the numbers that she has given regarding roads does not include Franklin Boulevard, just the local roads off of Franklin.

This area is intended to provide for the creation of employment opportunities typically associated with family-wage jobs in very close proximity to a future urban high-density residential neighborhood to:

- Help meet an identified need for employment land in Springfield;
- Capitalize on the riverfront and good visibility from/access to major transportation corridors; and
- Take advantage of the proximity of the University of Oregon and frequent high-speed transit services.

Primary Uses:

- Employment: Office
- Commercial: Professional, Scientific, or Technical Services

John Tamulonis asked if medical labs would fall into the second group. Molly responded that it would not. Medical labs would fall into the first group.

Secondary Uses:

- Commercial: Retail Sales & Services
- Commercial: Eating & Drinking Establishments
- Commercial: Personal Services
 - Predominantly to support nearby office uses
 - Limited to ground floor of primary use fronting public realm

Molly went on to say that the reason for this is to preserve enough of Subarea C for employment uses and to concentrate a critical mass of the retail, eating and drinking, and personal services in the Residential Mix-Use area while recognizing that there is a need for these kinds of support commercial in an office employment environment. Molly noted that similar to the parking question that Zack had, if, for instance, an office has child care or an indoor recreation center or a cafeteria not serving the public and only serving the employees, this is considered part of the office uses, it is not a separate use.

Zack Pardo asked if the Springfield Development Code regulation about parking and roads in the riverfront area includes any kind of ratio of parking or roads with regards to the total land area. Molly answered that currently in the parking section of the Code, it goes by uses so it's a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. Currently, there are provisions in the Springfield Development Code for a reduction in those parking standards and the current thinking is that instead of proposing a completely new scheme for parking, that same parking would apply but will list the ways that someone could get reduced parking considered.

Mr. Pardo responded that it seems that if you're looking at 2,000 housing units that equates to 3,000 parking spots. Molly responded that with a 50 du/acre minimum, at full build-out that would be closer to 1,000 dwelling units. She added for instance, if there is an office use next to a residential use, shared parking is one of the ways developers can obtain parking reductions. Another way to get reductions is to include on-street parking, a traffic impact analysis, or transportation demand management (for example, if someone were to provide "Share Cars" like Zip Cars that citizens can check-out).

Mr. Pardo asked if there would be allowances made because it's a riverfront area but a certain amount of the area had no pavement at all. Molly asked George if he would speak to stormwater and how that would ultimately affect the plan. George replied that there is a Riparian Setback area which will be available to use for certain stormwater functions. He added that there are a lot of technologies that are available now to manage stormwater on sites where there is not a lot of ground area available to manage stormwater. If you were to pave an entire site, about 25% of your site is going to be necessary for managing stormwater. The reality with low impact development is that it can easily come down into 65% on average in Oregon. If you're really efficient at it, you can run that down by 90% reduction and only 10% of that 25% would be needed for stormwater management. There is a lot of variability and part of it depends on how much of these technologies you are willing to invest in to use the development area for other things. Mr. Pardo asked if George was referring to porous pavers or green roofs. George said yes, and he also mentioned infiltrating planters, a number of technologies where instead of water being 3 or 4 inches deep over a big area it might be 2 feet deep for a short time in one of its trenches and then percolate into the ground, which is a double advantage because it replenishes ground water supply and takes care of things more naturally. A lot of things are changing and a lot of new technologies are available.

Mr. Seider had two questions. The first one was regarding housing units on page 4 that talks about Glenwood North Riverfront Housing District with 2,000 residences surrounded by parks oriented to riverfront. Molly asked about the document Mr. Seider was referring to. Mr. Seider replied that it was the Downtown District Urban Design Plan. Molly replied that this document is for Downtown and was sent out by Linda Pauly and does not apply to the staff proposal for Glenwood. Linda Pauly clarified that Crandall Arambula was stating in their report that Glenwood has the potential capacity for 2,000 dwelling units, but that is not what staff is proposing in terms of minimum development requirements.

Mr. Seider also asked when referring Subarea B and C is anything being done to address floor area ratio to encourage densities. Molly replied that staff has not come to the Committee yet with specific development standards. She said that staff is currently thinking about a minimum of two-stories, and another option is the Floor Area Ratio, so either we can do minimums and maximums or look at floor area ratio. Staff has heard from several people that Floor Area Ratios really do not work. Staff knows that they are part of the Nodal Requirement; in the past, the State has expressed a desire to see the use of Floor Area Ratios, so staff may have to explore the topic here. Molly believes that if staff

recommends Floor Area Ratios the starting point for discussion will be what Crandall Arambula was talking about with .75 in Area B and .5 in Area C.

John Tamulonis asked if Molly felt it would be an interesting conversation to look at Floor Area Ratio advantages and disadvantages and how the City might be able to craft something different than Floor Area Ratios. Molly agreed and said that the Floor Area Ratio would be discussed further with a sub-committee that has specific interest and knowledge with this topic.

Steve Ramseur asked if there is room for laundromats in any of the commercial designations. Molly responded that yes, and that laundromats is what staff would consider a Personal Service. Dry cleaner and laundromats are the classified the same.

Molly stated that because Area C is so wide and has interesting constraints, there are several exceptions that staff is proposing. These exceptions would be for additional secondary uses in limited locations. The Primary use would still be the office, but there could be other standalone ~~other~~ uses in limited locations.

Molly went on to say that staff knows that lodging, and in particular extended stay hotels, are often a typical component of an office/employment area, and staff recognizes that part of Area C is within easy access to I-5 and also in close proximity to the University of Oregon. So, in Area C, north of Franklin Boulevard and also south of Franklin Boulevard and west of Glenwood Boulevard Commercial: Hospitality Services would be permitted either as a standalone building or a vertical mix with one of the other uses in limited locations. Randy Hledik asked why this description would not work for the eastern portion of the subarea on the south side of Franklin. Molly responded that the secondary use needs to be restricted somehow. We cannot say that it is a permitted use everywhere, or we can no longer say this is an office mixed-use area with office dominance. A way we can control that would be by saying, ground floor, but who wants a hotel on just the ground floor of an office building? We could also do something like; only 10% of Area C can be this use. Then a hotel comes in and the hotel shape is exactly 10.001%, and then we have to get an adjustment. We find that this strategy does not work well in other areas of the City and the best way around that is restricting by location.

Molly continued, saying that due to the challenges of wetlands and the adjacency of the Transfer Facility, which is likely to change over time, and the proximity to the University of Oregon, staff is proposing adding flexibility in the area south of Franklin Boulevard, west of Glenwood Boulevard. Here, a metropolitan-oriented civic use, such as a fire station, could be a standalone secondary use. High density residential uses with a minimum threshold of 20 du/acre could also be a standalone secondary use or part of a vertical mix. Steve Ramseur asked about a community center. Molly replied yes, and mentioned that in all of these descriptions, civic uses in general, for instance, a satellite Library or satellite Post Office, could go in any of the areas where the professional office ground floor type user could go.

Zack Pardo asked what the red circles on the map are for. Molly replied that they are used as a reference point. The current thinking is that the future EmX stations would be at the corner of Franklin and Henderson and at the intersection of Brooklyn and Franklin, so the red circles show a quarter mile radius from these stations, which is typically an easy walking distance on sidewalks. These circles also show that almost all of the Franklin Riverfront is within a quarter mile of one of the two future station locations and certainly within one-half mile.

Molly said that the final exception area is north of Franklin, west of Glenwood Boulevard. This is a really narrow land mass already and with the Riparian Setback makes it even narrower. In this area, even more flexibility would be provided for University-related uses compatible with the office mixed-use orientation, either as standalone or part of a vertical mix.

Subarea D – Employment Mixed-Use

Molly stated that this is a very large area, which has been discussed at length at the previous meeting. At this point, the plan will only identify intersection locations and components of the McVay cross section for the future but would not lay out a street grid, so Molly did not have a percentage of what roads would be, but the riparian setback would be approximately 16%.

Staff is recommending that this area be designated Employment Mixed-Use, and it would be intended as an employment center comprised of office employment and compatible industrial uses to promote the creation of a wide range of family-wage jobs serving the region and also to complement the future urban high density residential neighborhood and the existing residential neighborhood. This would help to meet an identified need for employment land in Springfield and capitalize on the riverfront and easy access to major transportation corridors, including I-5. Subarea D is in the heart of the metropolitan area, most of the parcels are relatively flat, there are also fewer property owners and larger parcel sizes. Subarea D is also in very close proximity to existing industrial uses and a heavily used freight rail corridor.

Staff is proposing that the primary uses be:

- Commercial: Professional, Scientific, or Technical Services
- Employment: Office
- Employment: LMI – (Light Medium Industrial)

Similar to Subarea C, what would be considered secondary uses are the commercial uses that predominantly support the employment uses. The secondary uses would be limited to the ground floor of the primary use fronting the public realm for the same reasons talked about in Subarea C (wanting to preserve the employment land, wanting to concentrate the retail/commercial in the residential and commercial-dominated areas).

- Commercial: Retail Sales & Services
- Commercial: Eating & Drinking Establishments
- Commercial: Personal Services

What really distinguishes Area D from C is the addition of Light Medium Industrial as a primary use. This area is also considered appropriate for a hospital as a primary use, should that come back on the table. It is similar to Area C in terms of accessory uses, so if child care, a recreational center, or cafeteria are considered part of the primary use. Bill Seider asked which one of the definitions the hospital would fit in. Molly responded that it would not fit under these definitions. It is considered as an exception primary use.

Zack Pardo asked if anyone considered what effect possible dam removal would have on this plan. Gary Karp responded that he cannot speak specifically to dam removal, but what he can tell the Committee is that there is a joint Hazard Mitigation Plan for Eugene and Springfield that was adopted in 2004 that talks about dam safety and programs that have been established to deal with that. Gary brought copies for the Committee. Mr. Pardo said he is not talking about advocating or opposing the removal, he is talking about the possibility, because of the health of the watershed, that it becomes necessary to remove the dam, and since this is an area that is primarily a floodplain and since staff is talking 20 to 30 years out. Steve was wondering if this has been given any consideration and what, if any, effect it would have on this type of development, Steve stated it is certainly happening in some places and it is happening not because they are saving the fishies or the Bambis, it is happening because people need good quality water and to provide a live river. Gary responded that given the past history of Glenwood and flooding, the dams have pretty much prevented flooding since their construction. It seems like a pretty small chance of that action occurring. Mr. Pardo replied that he knows this is not something that is set in concrete with regards to the deconstruction of the dam, but it seems like since we have discussed a riverfront of floodplain that this would be an appropriate discussion. Randy Hledik commented that it would be a reason for the Committee to all get back together and re-plan Glenwood and the rest of Springfield.

Molly opened the floor for the Committee to ask questions or if they would rather talk and deliberate, or talk about consensus, or table their consensus to another time; she left it up to the Committee to decide the next step.

Steve Roth had a question about subarea A, if first floor commercial is required of a potential development, or is this optional? Molly responded that this is optional because staff knows that there is not always a market for commercial.

Randy Hledik would like to understand the logic and reasoning behind why staff is proposing 50 du/acre, why not 35. Molly explained that Crandall Arambula proposed 100 du/acre. Staff realizes that with the current market conditions that 100 du/acre is not realistic but aspirational. Staff wanted something that would be definitely different from the current High Density Residential. Staff looked at building heights that people seem to be comfortable with, which is 4 to 6 stories and what those buildings typically look like and how they relate to the street and the feel in that kind of environment. The Tate is about 50 du/acre and is comfortable at the street level. So, the numbers are a starting point. Mr. Hledik said that there had been a couple of market studies as he recalls, and that there was one that ECONorthwest did, which looked at Glenwood and then one also with APEX. John Tamulonis responded that there was one that the City did that was not targeted to housing. There was one by ZHA Associates; they were looking at about 1,700 units in the 48 acres. Bill Seider said that 34.5 acres times 50 is 1,700. Molly reminded the Committee that they need to try and remember that a certain percentage of this property is undevelopable due to the riparian setback, roads etc. John Tamulonis replied that this is not too different because it was not the full 48 acres. Molly added that only 30% of the 48 acres could be residential under the Riverfront Plan.

John Tamulonis said that staff could bring back some pictures of the different types of densities. Molly also said the Crandall Arambula PowerPoints had pictures showing different densities. Randy Hledik asked how many stories the Aurora building is. John replied that it is 4 over 1 and that Royal was the same. Bill Seider said that Broadway is 3 over 1. John said that you could go 2 concrete floors and 4 over which is not very typical. It would be like 2 commercial, and that is with 15' ceilings interior. Mr. Hledik said Crescent is five stories. John Tamulonis said he is not sure, but staff can find that out.

Molly asked Susan Ban if she knew the density of West Town on 8th in Eugene because they have the live work units which are much lower heights and have a better relationship to the street, and then much more density behind. Randy Hledik said that his concern is that they have mentioned Aurora, Royal, Broadway, any of these examples, the Tate, they are single examples out there, and then we are talking about 30+ acres here. Molly responded that when you subtract the riparian area, roads and parks, the net acreage is more like 23 acres. Susan Ban said that Broadway would be an example where this type of development is on both sides of the street. Mr. Hledik does not think there is a market for the proposed density. Molly replied that we do not want to put a plan out there that has to be amended the day it is adopted, but we also do not want to set really low expectations. We want investments that generate tax increments; we also want private investment that is going to support the public investment that goes into Franklin, so we need to test the idea and see if it works. If in 10 years there is no development changing a density range that is something that can be adjusted much more easily than reworking the whole plan.

Ken Schmidt asked if the Committee has to accept or vote on the entire land use plan or can the Committee accept portions of it and work on the other portions. Molly replied that the Committee could put forth amendments to what is proposed. Molly would rather see a whole set of thoughts about tonight rather than piecing it out. Mr. Schmidt suggested that if the Committee cannot find consensus on everything that the Committee at least find consensus to move forward, then maybe comeback and work on one area or more. He is getting the feeling that maybe there is some uneasiness on some of the areas. He believes everyone would like to move forward, as he does.

Molly said she wants to see where everyone stands with what has been presented. The Committee needs to decide if they want more discussion, if they want to offer more opinions, or if they want to try a consensus vote and see where they stand. Molly wants the Committee to remember that there are only 12 of the 19 Committee members in attendance tonight. Molly said that they have quorum but they do not have the opinions of the rest of the Committee and several of the people absent were not at the last meeting, so we do not know what level of understanding there is about the proposal.

Randy Hledik agrees with Bill Seider's comment at the beginning of the meeting about not having had something in hand to look at. With a Committee of this size, this is highly unusual to try and come to consensus without a document in hand. Mr. Hledik said that Molly gave a great presentation, but it is hard to make a decision when you do not have the document in front of you. Molly said staff recognizes that it is hard not having the document. Staff wanted to get something to the Committee in written form beforehand, but could not. She suggested that what might be helpful is to go around one-by-one and have each member say what their thoughts are about the information presented tonight, and then at least staff would have a sense about their feeling prior to the August meeting.

Steve Ramseur suggested that they do the consensus process because it would indicate how much reservation each member has. It is kind of like a straw vote, which should not take much time. Starting with the question of passing it as is, but if people are not comfortable with that then maybe the Committee should wait on the vote until the next meeting. Mr. Ramseur asked if the Committee wanted to see where they are at. The Committee asked what they were voting on. Roxi Thoren asked Mr. Ramseur if he is making the call for consensus as a straw vote just to see if people fully approve, approve with reservation, would be willing to pass, have minor reservations, significant reservations, absolutely cannot support.

Mr. Oldham asked that the Committee step back from that and say that they have not had enough time to fully digest the material and would like to have a copy of the presentation that they had tonight before even taking a vote. Roxi Thoren suggested that given the concerns they have that a very valid response is saying he cannot approve this, because he has not been able to review the work, has not had time to think about it, so for those reasons, he cannot support moving forward with this plan. There was general agreement that the Committee wished to have some time to digest the material.

Molly asked if staff posted the presentation, would that be helpful or at what point does the Committee want the full written Chapter before they vote. How much time does the Committee want with the materials. One of the Committee members suggested two weeks. Molly responded that staff could meet the two week request. Mr. Seider asked if the Chapters would include the details and the other types of restrictions and provisions. Molly replied that it wouldn't include design standards what staff is proposing in terms of building form, height and setbacks. It would include everything that was discussed in terms of detail. Susan Ban added that this would give the Committee members time to engage staff with questions, clarifications and also if they needed additional data, so that when they meet in August they could address those questions and concerns. Bill Seider agreed that he would rather meet longer in August if it took another hour to get approvals for what staff is looking for, rather than waiting another month which would put this behind schedule.

Molly asked the Committee about the start time for these monthly meetings. Molly suggested that they start the meetings at 5:30 and then wanted to know how late the Committee is comfortable with. Staff doesn't want to set-up meetings that set an expectation for three hour meetings. The Committee said they would rather stay a little late and work through these sections, rather than drawing this project out, they really want to get some of these issues resolved. John Tamulonis suggested that meals could be provided.

Molly announced that the next meeting is scheduled for August 25, 2010. Staff will post the presentation as soon as possible. The draft Chapter will probably take another week or so to get posted, but it will definitely be posted two weeks prior to the August meeting. Once the materials are posted, Molly will send an email letting the Committee know that the documents have been posted.

Roxi Thoren asked if there is a forum for asking questions prior to the August meeting. Molly said that they can either email her or call. Molly reminded the Committee that they are not allowed to meet outside of the public meetings that are held.

- **ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned at 8:07

(Recorded and Transcribed by Brenda Jones)