

MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission
Springfield City Hall
Jesse Main Room
225 Fifth Street, Springfield

February 4, 2003
6 p.m.

PRESENT: Marilyn Phillips, Chair; Tim Malloy, Lee Beyer, William Carpenter, jr., Jim Burford, Steve Moe, Vice Chair, Greg Shaver, members; Greg Mott, Mel Oberst, Colin Stephens, Chuck Gottfried, City of Springfield staff; Joe Leahy, City Attorney.

Commissioner Phillips called the Springfield Planning Commission Work Session to order at 6:05 p.m.

1. **Review of Planning Commission Recommendation for PeaceHealth Plan Amendment**

The Planning Commission voted on January 22, 2003 to forward an affirmative recommendation to the City Council for the PeaceHealth Plan amendment applications (Jo. No.'s 2002-08-0243 and 2002-08-0244). The Commission added three conditions of approval to the recommendation that was contained in the January 22 Commission packets. Staff asks the Commission to review the attached revised recommendation and approve the language that incorporates the conditions.

Mr. Stephens, Planner II, briefly reviewed the revised language in the applications package that incorporated the three conditions of approval.

Commissioner Malloy recused himself from the discussion the item because of a possible conflict of interest.

Mr. Stephens pointed out the condition limiting height of the hospital to 60 feet was contained on page 3, as the last sentence under Residential Implementation Action 12.6, which now read: "Buildings in the MS (Medical Services) District shall not exceed 60 feet in height."

Mr. Stephens drew the commissioners' attention to page 10, which contained the other two conditions imposed by the Commission. He said the condition requiring that the master plan contain a hospital was added as Condition 3. He stated that this condition would make the hospital requirement site-specific and not applicable to all master plans for property over five acres.

He said a "sunset" provision, in the event the master plan was not approved, was added as Condition 4. He stated the new language would request the City Attorney's Office develop language that, in the event approval is not obtained, would have the City initiate amendments to the Metro Plan and the Gateway Refinement Plan that would re-plan for development of the Gateway MDR site without a hospital. They would allow for a refreshed view of the property, rather than reverting back to the 1991 plan under a total sunset provision.

Commissioner Shaver expressed concern that it was the Commission's intent with the sunset provision to revert back to the original zoning, rather than initiate new planning activities in the event approval of the master plan was not obtained. Mr. Stephens explained that there were a number of provisions, such as those that enabled nodal development, that would be lost in a reversion to the original plan and his proposed language would preserve these features. Commissioner Shaver again stated concern that the Commission's original intent was not clearly articulated and the proposed language would bind the City to more processes.

Commissioner Burford arrived at 6:25 p.m.

Mr. Leahy agreed that a strong statement of intent should be included and offered to work with staff to develop language, similar to the statement made by Commissioner Carpenter on this subject at the January 21, 2003 meeting, to clarify the Commission's intent.

In response to a question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Stephens stated that language in Items 1.1 and 1.2 on page 1 of the application had been modified by replacing the word "approximately" with the phrase "up to" in reference to the 33 acres of land.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the 60 feet height restriction would include mechanical fixtures located on the roof. Mr. Oberst replied that under the code definition, fixtures on the roof of a structure were not included in the calculation of height. Commissioner Beyer asked if 60 feet height would allow the hospital to have five floors. Mr. Stephens said the applicant indicated it was unlikely more than three floors could be accommodated by a 60 foot height because the construction and utility chase requirements.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the height restriction could be expressed as five floors, instead of 60 feet. Mr. Leahy said that the motion specifically stated a 60 feet height restriction as the condition. However, the Commission's wish to allow for five floors could be articulated in intent language added to the application for the City Council's consideration.

Commissioner Moe asked whether a hospital overlay district would apply to the area if the master plan was approved. Mr. Stephens said the hospital overlay district was created specifically for McKenzie-Willamette Hospital and would not automatically apply to the PeaceHealth Plan amendment applications. Mr. Mott noted that the hospital overlay district did not include a height restriction, but a commercial district designation did limit building height to 60 feet. Mr. Stephens reiterated that the Commission's direction was to retain the language limiting height to 60 feet and include intent language with respect to allowing structures with five floors, and to clarify the intent of the "sunset" provision in the event a master plan with a hospital is not approved.

Commissioner Malloy returned to the table.

2. Update on Springfield Storm Water Management Program Plan Development

The City is preparing to submit its first ever Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit application, which is required under the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) "Phase II" storm water program rules. The application must be submitted by March 10, 2003, and a completed Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) must be submitted no later than March 10, 2004.

Mr. Gottfried provided an overview of the permit application process. Once a permit was granted, the City had one year to develop and submit a SWMPP. He said final guidance from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) required the City to submit a summary outline of its SWMPP. Mr. Gottfried stated that the SWMPP would formalize the programs currently in place and the strategy for new development. He noted one of the required control measures was to ensure public involvement in the SWMPP development.

Commissioner Shaver commented that significant funds would be required to sponsor seminars under the plan. Mr. Gottfried said the workshops and seminars were to educate contractors, engineers, architects, designers, developers, and others who had the potential to impact storm water quality. Commissioner Shaver asked if it was possible to combine training efforts with other cities. Mr. Gottfried replied that some efforts would be coordinated with the City of Eugene, which had a highly developed educational program that could be useful. He said that educational efforts would be focused on local participants.

Commissioner Shaver asked whether slope rather than one acre should trigger special permit requirements. Mr. Gottfried replied that this was a federal requirement and the City's requirement was more restrictive, with special permit requirements triggered by fifty cubic yards. He added that these types of requirements were not part of the permit application process, but would be included in the SWMPP.

Commissioners discussed the need to simplify or streamline the City's permitting process, as well as review building and development codes relating to runoff, to protect water quality but avoid unnecessary barriers to development, particularly of affordable housing. Innovative approaches such as alternatives to impervious surfaces, dry wells requiring infusion permits, "check box" permitting. Mr. Oberst said that when the plan is presented to the Commission for consideration in February or March, 2004, it will contain components of the City's overall plan for achieving clean water, including subcomponents that could recommend planning activities, code amendments, maintenance practices and other efforts consistent with the discussion.

Mr. Gottfried commented that submission of the permit application was a preliminary step not requiring any critical decisions. The planning process during the year prior to submission of the plan in March 2004 would allow for consideration of the issues raised by commissioners. He encouraged commissioners to accept the Public Involvement Plan (PIP), which was a critical element of the planning process. Mr. Oberst reminded commissioners that the PIP was consistent with Goal 1 of the City's policies for citizen participation in planning processes.

Commissioner Phillips adjourned the Work Session at 7:10 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)
\\CESRV900\MINUTES\2003\CITY OF SPRINGFIELD\PLANNING COMMISSION\CSPCWS030204.DOC