

DATE OF HEARING: March 1, 2011
TO: Springfield Planning Commission
FROM: Bill Grile, Development Services Director

**PLANNING
COMMISSION
TRANSMITTAL
MEMORANDUM**

ITEM TITLE:

BRIEFING AND DISCUSSION ABOUT THE PLANNING DIVISION'S COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Receive a briefing about the Planning Division's comprehensive planning work program, ask questions, and offer feedback.

ISSUE:

The Planning Division's comprehensive planning work program guides Springfield's long-range planning projects. From time to time, it is prudent for staff to brief the Planning Commission about these projects and their scheduled targets, providing an opportunity to address questions and hear feedback.

DISCUSSION:

The Development Services Department's Planning Division is comprised of two administrative divisions. One is the *Comprehensive Planning Section*, which is responsible for long-range planning projects. The Other is the *Urban Planning Section*; it administers and maintains the Springfield Development Code, which includes processing land use applications to develop and use property. Planning staff are assigned to each section but accept interchangeable assignments based on priorities, work load and expertise/skill sets.

Planning Division Manager Greg Mott relies on Linda Pauly to supervise the *Comprehensive Planning Section* and on Jim Donovan to supervise the *Urban Planning Section*. Five professional planners and technical support staff assist these three with work program responsibilities. Public Works staff, the City Attorney's Office and occasionally consultants also make important contributions.

This work session item will provide the Planning Commission with an update about the status of the Division's comprehensive planning work program priorities.

Comprehensive planning work program priorities at present are:

- (1) Completing the proposed ***Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan*** and HB3337-mandated urban growth boundary (UGB);
- (2) Updating the ***Glenwood Refinement Plan***; and
- (3) Implementing the ***Downtown Springfield Urban Design Plan***.

Staff will address questions and welcomes feedback.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. *Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan* Overview
2. *Glenwood Refinement Plan* Overview
3. *Downtown Springfield Urban Design Plan* Overview

Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Overview

- The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (aka, the Metro Plan) is nearly 30 years old. It was acknowledged (ie., approved) by the State in 1982 and since then has undergone only limited updates. Springfield and Eugene currently share a single UGB which cannot be modified without the consent of the other, along with Lane County's approval.
- By 2005, it was clear that Springfield and Eugene held different views about approaches to growth management, and that the Metro Plan's single UGB prevented Springfield from meeting its planning needs for residential, commercial and industrial lands.
- HB3337 was enacted by the 2007 Legislature. The law was needed in part because the Metro partners held different viewpoints about *when to plan ...* and because the Springfield City Council felt strongly that it needed to proceed with *addressing land needs sooner rather than later ...* and independently from Eugene.
- HB3337 requires the City to address and provide a 20-year supply of lands suitable for a variety of housing types and density mixes. And it requires Springfield to establish a discrete UGB, separate from the one in place in the Metro Plan for nearly 30 years.
- Springfield hired EcoNW to conduct a residential land needs analysis at the same time City undertook a study of the amount of residentially zoned lands available for a mix of housing types at various densities. These two studies merged into what has become the ***Springfield Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis***. The City Council adopted this in December 2009 to fulfill part of the mandated requirements of HB3337.
- At the same time, Springfield also asked EcoNW to evaluate the City's inventory of *employment lands ...* lands planned and zoned for commercial / industrial uses ... and to update its so-called *Goal 9* element based on contemporary factors and the need to provide jobs for its residents. So this work began as well and concluded with action by the City Council to adopt the ***Springfield Commercial/Industrial Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis*** in January 2010.
- These two studies ... the Residential and Commercial/Industrial evaluations ... were guided by technical advisory and citizen oversight committees. Over a dozen public meetings helped inform the public and guide outcomes. The studies produced two general conclusions:
 1. Springfield can meet its residential needs within the existing UGB area except for a shortfall of about 30 acres of High Density Residential lands (HDR) ... which can be met in Glenwood by redesignating lands for higher density housing.

2. Springfield needs roughly 640 more acres of employment lands ... and that even after planning for substantial redevelopment of existing lands within the City and UGB ... it is impossible to find these without expanding its UGB.
- Knowing that a UGB expansion must be considered, the City then commenced an analysis of alternative growth areas ... applying strict criteria established by Goal 14 and accompanying ORS priorities for selection of growth lands. This work led to more public input about the criteria and alternative areas ...

... and then to a pair of work sessions with the City and Lane County Planning Commissions about a year ago, with a public hearing in the spring and then a pair of meetings deliberating. Last May the Planning Commissions forwarded a pair of separate recommendations to their respected elected bodies.

Springfield PC:

1. Agreed that about 30 acres of HDR could be designated in Glenwood and that, at least statistically, a 20-year supply of residential lands could be established without expanding the UGB.
2. Fully supported the recommendation to identify 640 acres of needed employment lands, but recognized that additional public input, analysis and hearings would be needed to select the best areas for an expansion of the UGB for employment lands.

Lane Co PC:

1. Agreed with the residential findings and the Glenwood solution for additional HDR.
 2. Agreed that additional employment lands are needed and that some expansion of the UGB will be needed to designate these lands, but stopped short of agreeing that it should be the full amount of acreage needed to fulfill the identified 640 acres of needed employment lands.
- Since May, the City and its consultant team have been working to evaluate and address the extensive comments received in the Planning Commissions' record from last spring, and to conduct additional analysis about the suitability and constraints appurtenant to several **alternative growth** areas east of I-5 and near to Springfield. The public hearing testimony about employment lands and alternatives required us to conduct considerably more analysis than we'd anticipated would be necessary, but that work is now nearly complete.

- Given this background ... a **three-step process has been developed** to come before the City Council and Board of County Commissioners to consider what we understand can be an overwhelming amount of information and analysis.

STEP 1 began with the Joint Springfield / Lane County Work Session on February 22nd. This step simply asks both elected bodies to fulfill the requirements of HB3337 by doing two things: (1) adopting the *Springfield Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis*, (2) adopting the discrete Springfield UGB ... which is a site specific precise line where the existing UGB east of I-5 exists today. Nothing more. An April 4th JEO hearing is scheduled to take testimony about STEP 1. If is the City's and County's respective pleasure, adoption can occur as early as April. Adoption of the discrete UGB for Springfield represents the beginning of the *Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan*.

STEP 2 recognizes that adoption of the **STEP 1** action does not alter the fundamental relationship created by the Chapter 4 in the Metro Plan requiring concurrence by Springfield for a major plan amendments in Eugene, and vice versa ... in addition to approval by the Board of County Commissioners. Part of HB 3337's intent was to have City UGB and major land use decisions proposed by one city to be a matter for decision by that City and the County ... without requiring the 3-way concurrence in place here for nearly 30 years.

Amendments to Chapter 4 have been drafted by Springfield and are currently under review by Lane Co.'s and Eugene's planning and legal teams. A 3-party Metro Plan amendment process will commence soon with formal notice to DLCD ... and we'll schedule one or more JEO work sessions about the proposed amendment to Chapter 4 before the matter is presented for public hearings and adoption.

Adoption of **STEP 2** will fulfill the intent of HB3337 by redefining the planning relationship that each city has with the County. Springfield hopes to see this step completed by this summer, so you'll have plenty of time before then to consider the matter.

STEP 3 addresses Springfield's identified need for 640 acres additional employment lands. This consideration is scheduled to come before the City Council and Lane County Commissioners after completion of **STEP 2** ... and would not involve Eugene as a decision-maker. City staff and consultants are continuing to evaluate alternatives and as such, no firm dates are set for either work sessions or hearings on **STEP 3** ... but it's reasonable to think that a firm recommendation could be circulated for public review, town halls, and joint Planning Commission hearings next winter.

Glenwood Refinement Plan Overview

- In February 2008, the City Council directed staff to make updating the Glenwood Refinement Plan a priority work item. To best manage the complexity of updating the Glenwood Refinement Plan, Council directed staff to undertake this project in three phases.
- In October 2008, City staff initiated Phase I, which is being led by a City staff team with representatives from various divisions and departments. The Planning Commission also approved a Citizen Involvement Plan for the project at this time.
- In January 2009, a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), comprised of 20 individuals representing a wide variety of interests, was appointed by the Planning Commission to provide input, feedback, and guidance to staff and elected officials throughout the duration of the project. The CAC has met 12 times to date. CAC Participant categories are: Glenwood residents; Glenwood business/property owners; Glenwood employees; general public; developers; designers; realtors/lenders; chamber of commerce; and affordable housing advocate.
- A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was also selected to provide a sounding board for staff regarding more technical aspects of the project and to ensure interagency and interdepartmental coordination. TAC members represent: Willamalane; SUB; ODOT; LTD; Lane County Transportation; Glenwood Water District; Springfield School District; and Springfield Police, Fire, and City Manager's Office.
- Phase I accomplishments to date:
 - Inventoried and analyzed existing conditions and policies governing land use, transportation, housing, economic development, public facilities, and natural and historic resources in all of Glenwood; produced Existing Conditions Report Aug 2009.
 - Collaborated with CAC to develop a vision for all of Glenwood; produced Visioning Goal Statements Sept 2009.
 - Developed draft policy language, plan concepts, and development code language for the Glenwood Riverfront. The urban design firm, Crandall Arambula, was also hired to provide recommendations regarding land use and circulation for the Franklin portion of the riverfront in coordination with the concurrent Downtown planning project; produced final recommendations April 2010.
 - Developed draft Land Use chapter and draft Transportation Chapter (includes context information, figures, objectives, policies, and implementation strategies). The CAC recommended moving the draft Land Use chapter forward in Oct 2010, and it recommended moving the draft Transportation Chapter forward in Feb 2011.

- CAC issues of concern to date: minimum density for the Residential Mixed-Use designation; Franklin Boulevard right-of-way width and roundabout size (affected property owners); park block locations and size (affected property owners).
- Upcoming tasks March 2011 – December 2011:
- Complete development of draft chapters for Open Space, Housing, Economic Development, Public Facilities & Services, Historic Resources, and Annexation.
 - Complete draft development code text amendments and amendments to the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures manual.
 - Complete staff report.
 - Hold public open house(s).
 - Hold work sessions with Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions, Council, and Board of Commissioners.
 - Hold public hearings with Springfield and Planning Commissions, Council, and Board of Commissioners.
- Future work plan tasks:
- Complete Phases Two and Three (Glenwood Boulevard Corridor & Glenwood Core)



Public Projects Schedule

First 120 Days

1. Adopt Downtown District Urban Design Plan & Implementation Strategy
2. Adopt Parking Management Plan
3. Establish an Inter-Departmental Implementation Team
4. Develop Financing Strategy to Secure Mill Plaza Site and Public Parking Site
5. Initiate Update to Development Code, Design Guidelines, and Street Standards
6. Initiate Two-Way Main Street Transportation Study
7. Initiate Retail Strategy and Implementation Plan

Six Months

1. Secure Mill Plaza Site
2. Develop a High-Speed Rail Plan

One Year

1. Complete Two-Way Main Street Transportation Study
2. Complete Update to Development Code and Design Guidelines
3. Complete Retail Strategy and Implementation Plan
4. Design Mill Plaza
5. Secure Public Parking Site

Two to Three Years

1. Construct Mill Plaza
2. Design and Construct Public Parking Surface Lot
3. Obtain Approvals for Two-Way Main Street Recommendations
4. Complete Update to Street Standards

Three to Seven Years

1. Construct Main Street Demonstration Project
2. Construct Improvements Identified in Two-Way Main Street Transportation Study

2010	2011	2012	2013
Mar June Sept	Mar June Sept	Mar June Sept	Mar June Sept

