

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

Wednesday  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES  
October 20, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Bill Grile, Gary Karp, Molly Markarian, Greg Mott, Linda Pauly, George Walker, Brian Barnett, John Tamulonis

**CAC MEMBERS PRESENT:** Susan Ban, Erik Bishoff, Daniel Hill, Christine Kehoe, Eric Howard, Bill Woods, Randy Hledik, John Oldham, Steve Roth, Joan Armstead, Zack Pardo, Steve Ramseur, Dave Marra, Ken Schmidt

**PUBLIC ATTENDING:** Carole Knapel, Pam Leavitt, Les Leavitt, Christina Bond, Mark McCaffery, Jordan Cogburn

• **CALL TO ORDER –**

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

• **PUBLIC COMMENT –**

There was no public comment.

• **APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

Minutes for CAC Meetings #9 (June 30, 2010) and #10 (August 25, 2010) were approved without dissent.

• **LAND USE CHAPTER–**

Molly reiterated to the CAC the importance of attending CAC meetings for meaningful discussion and to enable decision-making to take place on the items brought to the CAC for their feedback and recommendations.

Molly proceeded to respond to the principal questions and comments raised by the CAC at the August 25, 2010 meeting. Due to technical issues with the audio recording, detailed transcription of the presentation is not possible.

After Molly's presentation, Co-Chair Steve Ramseur reminded the CAC of their role as advising staff on their recommendations that would eventually be carried to the City Council. He stated that it was likely the CAC could not arrive at consensus but that it was necessary to move along to other topics, so he suggested a straw vote and an opportunity for CAC members to voice their objections.

Zack Pardo stated that he disagrees with the current direction of the Plan, and he mentioned that he has prepared a minority report (attached). Zack passed around a diagram depicting his ideas and said that he could write them up in more detail at a later date. Zack stated that the principal issues he has with land use is that he thinks a lower density should be set for the minimum density, and he proposed 15 dwelling units per acre. He also stated that he thought there should be more public park presence on the riverfront.

John Oldham expressed that the 50 dwelling units per acre minimum is too high. He said that what he is most concerned with, though, is the development horizon. He is unsure of what he will want to do with his two properties in the next five to ten years, and he does not want to be constrained by a plan designation that only allows for uses that may not be in demand when he is ready to redevelop his property. He added that if he wants to sell his property in five years, it will be constrained by the plan designation and suggested some allowance for interim uses until the market is ready for the type of development outlined in the plan designations. For instance, what if it makes sense to develop his land for batting cages before residential development is in demand? John would like for there to be 'interim' permitted uses. John also said that he did not think the CAC's input was of much use since the staff presentation predominantly defended the staff recommendations with relatively few actual changes based on the CAC input.

Randy Hledik said that he supports the Land Use Chapter with the exception of the 50 dwelling units per acre minimum because he thinks it will deter short-term development proposals. He added that Wildish had hoped that the bakery development in Glenwood would spur more new development, but it did not, and he does not want the minimum density in the riverfront to prevent redevelopment from getting kick-started.

Dan Hill stated that he is very supportive of the Land Use Chapter and that overall, it is well thought out. He added that one of the reasons the density of the Tiffany Building shown in the presentation is so high is due to the size of the units and the number of units in a small building. Dan also commented on Zack's park comment by saying that creating a lot of parks and open spaces seems to be a new trend, but when there is no money to maintain parks they become a transient issue. He added that the riverfront is not lacking in parks, especially with Island Park across the river. He said that with such a narrow strip of land on the river, access for development is more important with a limited amount of parkland as proposed. He questioned whether there is a need for more park than what is currently proposed.

Zack Pardo responded to Dan Hill's park comments by saying that a park can be made available for anyone's use and that in his opinion, the entire land use plan is dedicated to commercial, industrial, and residential uses.

Christine Kehoe asked about increasing the riparian setback greater than 75 feet.

Ken Schmidt said that he agrees with Randy Hledik that 50 dwelling units per acre is too high, but he thinks that the 15 dwelling units per acre that Zack Pardo mentioned is too low. He said he appreciates Zack's comments but he believes there is a good balance to be achieved. He referenced the August 25, 2010 CAC minutes where the density concern was also raised.

Bill Woods asked for more clarity in how Subarea D differs from the current permitted land uses. Molly responded and talked about how the industrial uses were being permitted to remain in Subarea D to allow for a use, such as Bring.

Steve Roth stated that the density seems to be the real issue and asked if there is a number that the group can agree on. He expressed concern about the quality of development and opined that 40 dwelling units per acre would be high enough but not too high. Eric Howard mentioned 30-35.

Randy Hledik responded 25-30 dwelling units per acre. Dan Hill said that it should be based on market research and the cost to build certain density levels. Joan Armstead asked if it was possible to decide on density in that manner.

Molly said that she wanted to hear from everyone. Christine Kehoe said that she agrees with the Land Use Chapter. Susan Ban concurred. John Oldham said no. Dave Marra said the density should be lower.

Erik Bishoff mentioned that when the CAC started meeting, the group was looking at the future, and what he is hearing from the group now is the present. He thinks 50 dwelling units per acre is

reasonable and that in the future there will be a demand for that level of density in close proximity to the UO and amenities.

Molly asked the CAC to indicate their level of support for the Land Use Chapter with their hands/fingers as per the consensus reference numbers (i.e. Five fingers represent strong support for the proposal while four fingers represent support. Three fingers indicate a willingness to approve the proposal without the need for further discussion. Two fingers indicate the need for further discussion about minor concerns. One finger indicates more significant concerns, and a closed fist (block) indicates unwillingness to support due to significant concerns). The response was as follows:

Christine Kehoe – 3  
Susan Ban – 4  
John Oldham – fist  
Dave Marra – 1  
Zack Pardo – fist  
Randy Hledik – fist  
Bill Woods – 3  
Ken Schmidt – 1  
Dan Hill – 2  
Steve Roth – 2  
Eric Howard – 2  
Joan Armstead – 4  
Steve Ramseur – 4  
Erik Bishoff – 4

Molly then asked those people who had indicated fewer than three fingers what was preventing them from supporting the Chapter, and the response was as follows:

John Oldham – density (suggested 30 du/acre) & John Oldham's concerns described above  
Dave Marra – density (suggested 30 du/acre)  
Zack Pardo – density (suggested 25 du/acre) & Zack Pardo's concerns described above  
Randy Hledik – density (suggested 30 du/acre)  
Ken Schmidt – density (suggested 40 du/acre) & John Oldham's concerns described above  
Dan Hill – density (suggested 30 du/acre)  
Steve Roth – density (suggested 40 du/acre)  
Eric Howard – density (suggested 30 du/acre)

The CAC concurred that they could not reach consensus on a minimum level of density. Randy Hledik suggested that the CAC members' range of 25-40 dwelling units per acre be forwarded to the Planning Commission and Council so that the CAC could move on to the Transportation Chapter.

- **NEXT STEPS –**

Molly notified the CAC that she would be emailing the draft Transportation chapter prior to the November 17<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting and that a sub-committee would be taking a closer look at the chapter prior to the CAC meeting.

- **ADJOURN –**

Meeting adjourned at 7:45pm



PRELIMINARY PLAN

- MINORITY RIVERFRONT PLAN
- RESIDENTIAL (15+ UNITS/AC)
- FRANKLIN - LOCAL COMMERCE/RETAIL
- SIDESTREETS - RETAIL (1ST FL. OF RES.)
- PARK - RIPARIAN (NATURAL VEGETATION)
- BANDSHELL, EVENTS BLDG. (LARGE)
- OFFICE, EMPLOYMENT THROUGHOUT
- MAXIMUM 3 STORIES ON RIVER BLOCKS
- 1ST FL. SHOPS, RESTAURANTS, ETC.

