

## M I N U T E S

Springfield Planning Commission  
Jesse Maine Room--225 Fifth Street--Springfield

### WORK SESSION

October 21, 2003  
6 p.m.

PRESENT: Steve Moe, Chair; Lee Beyer, James Burford, Bill Carpenter, David Cole, Gayle Decker, members; Greg Mott, Mel Oberst, Colin Stephens, Gary McKenney, City of Springfield.

Commissioner Moe called the meeting of the Springfield Planning Commission to order.

#### 1. PEACEHEALTH MASTER PLAN

Mr. Oberst, Planning Supervisor introduced the topic. He encouraged the commission to take its time to do a thorough review of the PeaceHealth Master Plan and noted the added meeting date of October 28, 2003, to complete the review.

Commissioner Beyer arrived. Commissioner Decker arrived.

Commissioner Carpenter inquired as to the public notice given for the meeting. Mr. Stephens, Planner III indicated that typically, commission work sessions were not noticed, although *The Register-Guard* generally published them. All public hearings were noticed. Commissioner Carpenter requested a public notice for work sessions on the topic given its controversial nature. Mr. Oberst agreed. Ms. Kieran, City Attorney reminded the commission that it would not be taking public comment at work sessions. Commissioner Beyer determined from Mr. Stephens that copies of the public record were available at the library.

Mr. Stephens reported that the master plan application was being processed concurrently with a zone change application. He anticipated that the commission would make a recommendation to the City Council on December 16, 2003. The council would then hold its work sessions on the issue and a public hearing before deliberating early January 2004.

Mr. Stephens recalled the commission's July 15, 2003, work session on the PeaceHealth Master Plan, which was accepted as complete on August 21, 2003. After the application had been accepted, Mr. Stephens had followed the City's limited land use process. He first distributed the application to the City's Development Review Committee, composed of City staff members from different departments, and local affected government agencies. A series of meetings was held to discuss concerns of the committee and affected agencies. The resulting comments on the application were provided to him. Mr. Stephens said that he revised and expanded on the comments, and they were reflected in *Attachment 1, Discussion and Draft Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval*. Staff was currently recommending 78 conditions of approval. He emphasized the draft nature of the attachment as he anticipated there would be additional changes to the conditions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Shaver regarding many “placeholder” recommendations included Attachment 1 Mr. Stephens indicated that the complete draft staff recommendation would be available to the commission and the public prior to the public hearing on November 12, 2003, as per the City Code.

Mr. Stephens commenced his review of the master plan with the 17-page plan set included in the commission’s packet. He called the commission’s attention to an extensive listing of the studies done in conjunction with the master plan on the cover page. He noted the legal description and boundaries map (page 1.1) and the existing easements map (page 1.2). He pointed out that 100-year flood way on a master plan map at the request of Commissioner Carpenter.

Mr. Stephens referred to the topographic map (page 1.3) and said it did not reflect the grading that had occurred on the site in preparation for construction. Commissioner Burford asked about tree preservation plans. Mr. Stephens said that the applicant would need a tree-felling permit to fell five or more trees on the site in a calendar year. The City would also require that the areas identified as containing significant vegetation in the Gateway Refinement Plan be paid special attention. PeaceHealth must demonstrate how it would relate to those areas in the future. It appeared that the hospital itself would encroach somewhat on a grove of trees. Staff judged the encroachment acceptable because PeaceHealth proposed to enhance the grove with more trees.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the zoning diagram (page 1.4) Commissioner Beyer asked if PeaceHealth’s development would preclude commercial development of the area to the north not owned by PeaceHealth. Mr. Stephens said the nature of the development that would occur was a placeholder question, and he would get back to Commissioner Beyer on the question.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Stephens said that the Gateway Refinement Plan allowed for 38 acres of the property to be designated Mixed-Use Commercial (MUC) and for 66 acres to be designated Medical Services (MS). The balance of the property was to be Medium-Density Residential (MDR). Commissioner Beyer said that he was concerned that the commission’s decision regarding the PeaceHealth development would compromise the City’s ability to plan for the remainder of the area. Mr. Stephens said that staff recognized the concern and did not want to create a situation where that occurred.

Mr. Stephens called the commission’s attention to the location of the proposed Lane Transit District (LTD) transit station on the zoning diagram. The station would be adjacent to the hospital’s main entrance. He said that the dotted line on the map indicated a quarter-mile distance from the station, in compliance with Article 41 of the Springfield Development Code, which stated that the overlay should be applied approximately one-quarter mile from a transit stop.

Mr. Stephens identified the location of the parkway extension at the request of Commissioner Beyer and noted the right-of-way of Cardinal Way and River Bend Street on the map. Commissioner Shaver asked why the roads traveling through the MUC area were designated as MDR. Mr. Stephens said that it was to preserve the amount of MUC-designated land on the property.

Mr. Stephens said that the application of the nodal overlay to the property was a staff-recommended condition of approval and the LTD transit station was key, to the overlay. He recommended that the commission forward a recommendation to the City Council that the City initiate the application of the nodal overlay district to

the property. That would allow the City to contact the property owners in the surrounding area and determine the exact location of the node's boundaries. Mr. Stephens noted that the City's consultants, Crandall Arambula of Portland, concurred with the staff recommendation. He said that implementation of the recommendation would require an amendment to the Gateway Refinement Plan.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Stephens clarified that the MS zoning did not overlay the MDR area but could be applied to the MDR plan designation because of the manner in which the code was structured. There were standards associated with that, such as a requirement that the use be located on an arterial street.

Commissioner Burford believed that the transit station served the MUC and MS areas to a greater degree than it served the MDR area. He asked how that fit the City's nodal development standards. Mr. Stephens said that ultimately, the node would be expanded beyond the property owned by PeaceHealth, and the standards did not preclude going beyond one-quarter mile. Commissioner Burford questioned whether a better location for the transit station was closer to the residential areas. Mr. Stephens said that was a possibility.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to a master plan map (page 1.5a). He pointed out the location of the proposed hospital, the existing and proposed road system serving the PeaceHealth property, and future roads serving adjacent vacant properties.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer about Baldy View Lane, Mr. Stephens said that was a placeholder in the conditions. City staff did not feel that the roadway system proposed by PeaceHealth was the most efficient roadway system that could be achieved, and was recommending that River Bend Road continue further to the north and intersect with Deadmond Ferry Road and Baldy View Lane. Commissioner Beyer believed that it made more sense to take the road through Mr. Stephens concurred; otherwise, the result was out-of-direction travel. He said that staff continued to discuss the issue with PeaceHealth and the owners of residential properties outside the city limits but adjacent to the hospital's property.

Commissioner Beyer asked about the location of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route. Mr. Stephens showed the proposed BRT route on the map. Commissioner Beyer suggested that LTD would be better off going out onto International Way.

Commissioner Moe expressed his concern about the adequacy of parking provided on the site. Mr. Stephens pointed out the location of proposed surface parking and said the northern medical office building would be constructed either concurrent with the parking structures or slightly afterwards. He agreed that the issue of parking was a concern. He pointed out the listing of the proposed parking spaces associated with each building on page 1.5a.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the City had a floor area ratio (FAR) requirement, or an assurance that the proposed two-story buildings would be built. He also asked how the City could ensure that a temporary "sea of parking" did not become permanent. Mr. Stephens said that the application satisfied Springfield's FAR requirements. Commissioner Beyer asked if the commission could add conditions that ensured that those requirements were met. Mr. Stephens said that one assurance the City had was its requirement that the site plan be in conformance with the master plan. The timing of the construction was harder to condition or assure. He said that to a certain extent, timing was driven by market forces. He said that the commission could build trigger mechanisms into the approval.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Burford, Mr. Stephens clarified that there was no FAR requirement in the MS zone, just in the MUC zone. It was intended to encourage more intensive use of the land. Parking was accounted for through another process. Mr. Stephens said that staff would look at every use

proposed on the site when calculating the minimum parking.

Mr. Stephens observed that if the master plan was approved, there would be additional applications needed for implementation, including a Type II site plan review application. That would include a review of parking, setbacks, landscaping, easements, access ways, etc. Staff would process a subdivision application for the entire property concurrently. Site plan application approval would be required before building permits would be issued. Mr. Oberst added that Type II applications were reviewed administratively, but must be in conformance with the commission-approved master plan.

Commissioner Beyer again expressed concern about what he perceived to be a “sea of parking,” and asked staff to compare what was proposed to the amount of structured parking provided at the current Sacred Heart facility in Eugene. He wanted to know how many spaces the hospital had now proportionate to the square footage at the proposed facility. Commissioner Beyer hoped there was a way to reduce the amount of surface parking.

Mr. Stephens noted the placeholder recommendation for the BRT alignment, saying staff was in discussions with LTD and PeaceHealth on the topic. Staff was investigating the potential of moving the route into the median on River Bend Drive. In response to a question from Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Stephens said that there was constricted right-of-way on Pioneer Parkway going south, and no room to accommodate BRT in a separate lane without condemnation. The BRT route would be in a travel lane on that road. He anticipated a resolution to the issue soon.

Commissioner Beyer asked about the location of the commercial development that would serve the residential development in the node. Mr. Stephens pointed the location of the proposed retail area, proposed to be constructed during Phase 2, on the master plan map. Commissioner Beyer did not believe the amount of commercial development being proposed to be adequate. He asked how the commission could ensure that the conditions did not lock out the development of other commercial to serve the residential development. Mr. Stephens said that the issue was also a concern for staff. He acknowledged the need to preserve commercial capacity in the area to accommodate commercial development, but reminded the commission that the MDR designation would allow for 20 percent retail, generally on the ground floor. Commissioner Beyer did not think the resulting development would be adequate to serve the residents in the node. He stressed the need to consider the area in a larger planning context.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the draft master plan housing concepts outlined on page 1.5b, and 1.5c of the plan set. He emphasized the tentative nature of the proposals and said the City expected the developer to come up with a plan that met market needs and satisfied the master plan. Mr. Stephens pointed out the areas proposed for MDR development. He said the applicant must meet minimum density standards of 725 units. If the nodal overlay was not applied, the development would still be subject to residential design standards. If the development was done in phases, the applicant must demonstrate how the development will meet the minimum density.

Mr. Stephens noted the location of the assisted living facilities in the MDR zone and further noted, in response to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, that the skilled nursing facilities were in the MS zone. Commissioner Beyer asked how staff calculated densities for the assisted living and skilled nursing facilities. Mr. Mott said that self-sufficient units were counted as a dwelling unit, but rooms dependent on centralized services were not. A bedroom was not considered a dwelling unit. Mr. Oberst reviewed the maximum density calculation for group care facilities in the Low-Density Residential (LDR) and MDR zones. Commissioner Beyer asked how staff accounted for the category of skilled nursing facilities. Mr. Stephens said that he would get back to the commission with an answer.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the site massing views sketches on page 1.5d of the plan set.

Commissioner Cole asked if the City had a height limit on parking garages. Mr. Stephens referred him to master plan solar impact sheet in the plan set (page 1.6d), which included a reference to Article 22.060 of the code (height standards for the MS zone) and illustrated the effect of that text. He indicated that a staff-recommended condition of approval was that the City applies its design standards for parking garages to the development. Those standards generally addressed ground floor considerations, and were intended to increase the aesthetics of parking structures. Commissioner Cole said that the proposed parking garage appeared to tower above north medical office building. Mr. Stephens acknowledged the need for balance between the provision of parking types.

Commissioner Decker asked about the potential of installing permeable parking surfaces on the site. Mr. Stephens said that Springfield depended on well water, and there were well fields in the Gateway area that the City wanted to protect from the runoff typical of parking lots. That runoff must be treated through bioswales and catch basins prior to its entering the stormwater system.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Burford, Mr. Stephens said that because of the location of the hospital, the applicant must comply with Article 17, which included the provisions City's wellhead overlay protection district.

Speaking to the site massing view sketches on page 1.5d, Mr. Stephens reminded the commission of the height limitation it recommended to the council, which the council chose not to adopt. The application initially proposed a height of 156 feet, which had since been reduced to 143 feet to the top of the ninth floor. Philip Farrington, representing PeaceHealth, clarified that the highest occupiable floor, the ninth floor, was 140 to 143 feet. Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. Farrington said that there was a mechanical penthouse above that, which PeaceHealth was trying to keep the building height at or below the height of the trees in the Douglas fir grove adjacent to the building, which were 150 to 155 feet tall.

Commissioner Decker asked if the City had fire equipment that could fight high-rise fires. Mr. Stephens said no, but staff included conditions of approval to specifically address that issue. The applicant was proposing design features that allowed stairways to be sealed and equipped with compressed air, allowing fire fighters to use stairwells to access the upper floors, as well as repel points from the roofs. Fire Marshal Al Girard indicated that the City had the ability to fight high-rise fires and the features included in the building assisted in that task.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the City had aesthetic standards for commercial development. Mr. Stephens said that the only such standards in the code were the standards for multi-unit residential and those that applied to commercial in MUC. He said that Article 40 had requirements for pedestrian amenities for parking garages. He recommended as a condition of approval that they be applied to the parking structure. Mr. Stephens said that he could ask PeaceHealth what it was proposing and the commission could adopt it as a standard.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Stephens said he would ask PeaceHealth to submit the exact height for the mechanical penthouse. He confirmed that PeaceHealth planned to install a helicopter landing pad. Commissioners speculated as to the location and height of the landing pad.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the conceptual parcel plan (page 1.7). He said that ultimately, the site will contain nine parcels. He confirmed, in response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, that any future development, regardless of development, would be subject to development through the approved master plan for the next 15 years, after which the master plan expired. Commissioner Beyer asked if the master plan

would then be revised. Mr. Stephens did not know what happened after 15 years. Commissioner Beyer thought the commission needed to give some thought to the issue given the size of the development. Mr. Stephens noted that much of what was contemplated in the master plan would have been completed by then, such as the establishment of easements and the installation of infrastructure.

Commissioner Carpenter asked why the master plan would expire. Mr. Stephens said that the expiration was called for in the code. Mr. Oberst indicated that when the process was initially adopted by the council, a master plan was elective rather than required. The master plan before the commission was required by the City of PeaceHealth as a condition of the annexation agreement. The annexation agreement references the code in regards to the master plan. Mr. Oberst pointed out that over time, codes change and the expiration date provided the City with benefits as well.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Burford, Mr. Stephens said that the City, through its actions, would establish the zoning for the property, and any proposed changes would require a master plan amendment and likely a Gateway Refinement Plan amendment.

Mr. Stephens discussed the phasing plan (page 1.8). Commissioner Shaver asked about the timing of parking construction. Mr. Stephens called his attention to the work summary on the page and reviewed it, confirming that the surface parking of concern to Commissioner Beyer would be built in Phase 1. Mr. Shaver asked about accelerating the construction of the parking garage. Mr. Stephens said that the City had been discussing the issue with the applicant. He said that the City could ask the applicant what elements of the project triggered what type of parking. Mr. Stephens said that if it was imperative to the commission to get structured parking earlier, perhaps the conditions should include some triggers.

In response to a concern expressed by Commissioner Burford regarding the impact of construction parking, Mr. Stephens said that staff was in discussion with the applicant how much parking could be provided for that purpose.

Commissioner Decker believed the parking structure should be required when the hospital was constructed to reduce the stress caused by added visits to the area and to reduce the impact of parking by reducing its footprint. She asked if there was a dedicated doctors' parking area included on the site plan. Mr. Stephens anticipated one would be provided.

Commissioner Moe said that he would like to know the hospital's plans for parking in the interim between the time the hospital was built and the parking garage was constructed. Mr. Stephens said he would follow up on the question with representatives of PeaceHealth.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Stephens confirmed that the north medical office building would be constructed in Phase 1.

Returning to the subject of the master plan expiration date, Mr. Stephens said that normally master plans last for seven years, but the code included a provision that allowed the master plan to last for no more than 15 years. PeaceHealth had requested a 15-year window and had based its studies on that timeframe. Mr. Oberst added that the master plan was subject to the standards in effect on adoption, except when the City was obliged by the State or federal government to revise its development standards. Commissioner Beyer believed that recent statute changes by the Oregon Legislature meant that master plans were further protected from changes in the State law as well.

Commissioner Decker asked what would happen if, over a period of 15 years, part of the property was developed while the remainder was not. She asked the consequences of that. Mr. Stephens pointed out that the

City could make individuals develop anything. Ms. Kieran said that master plan would continue to govern the area, including its zoning designations. When a developer came forward, there would be assurance that the master plan was implemented. Ms. Kieran suggested that the issue of when development occurred was one of timing, but acknowledged the uncertainty involved.

Commissioner Beyer posited a suggestion that the hospital and commercial areas developed but the MDR area did not; then, someone purchased the MDR portion of the property and wished to construct high-end houses rather than medium-density residential. Mr. Stephens said that would be very onerous given the refinement and master plan amendments required. Ms. Kieran noted the additional complication created by the State's residential land inventory requirements. Commissioner Carpenter suggested that it would be a less onerous burden on a property owner when the master plan expired. Ms. Kieran pointed out that the zoning on the property would not expire.

Commissioner Beyer said the City was under pressure from the State to implement nodal development, and the node before the commission was the first one. He said a serious question was "how do you make it happen?" He questioned what triggers could be designed so that more objectives of nodal development could be achieved. Commissioner Shaver said that another question was, would the State be satisfied? Commissioner Shaver termed nodal development a "joke" and the node before the commission a "real joke," but he was interested in getting the State "get off our back."

Mr. Oberst recalled that the Applegate Master Plan had included triggers related to phasing. Commissioner Shaver pointed out that the development had largely failed to materialize. Commissioner Beyer observed said that the Applegate proposal was not a bad one but the market had not let it happen.

Commissioner Carpenter said that other cities had used a master planning approach, and suggested that staff check with those communities about the pros and cons of allowing a master plan to expire.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Ms. Kieran said that she would get back to the commission about the distinctions between a seven-year plan and a fifteen-year plan.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to page 2.1, which showed the location of proposed transportation improvements. He pointed out the off-site transportation improvements associated with the development. Mr. Stephens addressed a question from Commissioner Burford about the timing of the Gateway/Beltline improvements, indicating that those improvements would not occur until 2009. He noted that PeaceHealth was contributing \$7 million to the project.

Commissioner Burford expressed concern about the timing of the construction of the extension of the Pioneer Parkway and the intersection at Gateway and Beltline. He was said that until those facilities were constructed and operated he did not see how the property could be served. He spoke of the impact of construction traffic and expressed concern that the surrounding transportation facilities would be driven to a lower level of service (LOS). Mr. McKenney clarified the Pioneer Parkway extension would be in service when the hospital opened. He said that TIA indicated that the Beltline/Gateway intersection will operate satisfactorily at that point (2007). He said that the traffic patterns in the future would be different when the parkway was built.

Commissioner Decker asked how the system would address the vehicles that entered the site during construction. Mr. McKenney said that those trips would be accommodated by the existing system. Staff had not required the hospital as part of the master plan to analyze the construction traffic, but the hospital would have to address the issue. He noted that PeaceHealth was considering the construction of a temporary road to accommodate construction traffic off Beltline. He concurred with a statement from Commissioner Decker that such a road would minimize the traffic going down Game Farm Road.

Commissioner Carpenter was concerned that the City was not requiring an analysis of the construction traffic. Mr. McKenney indicated that such an analysis was not required for the master plan stage but would be done later. Commissioner Carpenter asked how the commission could have input into that issue. Ms. Kieran said that there was no criterion that the commission could refer to in order to accomplish that at this stage. The master plan criteria were very broadly stated, and she would have to examine the chapter to determine how to structure the condition. Mr. McKenney said that staff would request that information at the site plan stage of the project.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if there were ever any circumstances where the construction traffic load outweighed the regular traffic load by a factor of five. Mr. McKenney said that could be true in the case of a small neighborhood street that normally carried only one or two hundred trips a day but was extended to serve a new subdivision of 300 houses. However, there were already tens of thousands of trips in the area in question, and it would require several thousand more to impact the level of service.

Commissioner Burford questioned the impact of the hospital construction traffic in combination with Christmas shopping traffic during the month of December.

Mr. Stephens said he would follow up to see what could be done at this stage in regards to construction parking.

Mr. Stephens referred the commission to the site access and circulation map in the plan set (page 2.2).

Commissioner Shaver asked why there were no bicycle lanes included on the Pioneer Parkway extension. He asked how bicycles would access the site. Mr. McKenney said that when the council approved the project, it directed staff not to include bicycle lanes on the extension, which carried large volumes of high-speed traffic. He confirmed, in response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Shaver, that there would be a median in the road. He briefly described the existing and proposed multi-modal and bicycle path system in the area and noted the connections that currently existed and those that would be made.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. McKenney said he could not predict what individual bicyclists would do in the absence of bicycle lanes on Pioneer Parkway, pointing out that bicyclists could ride on any road they wished, but he did not expect a lot of cyclists would choose to use such a high-volume, high-speed road.

Commissioner Beyer recalled that the City committed to the neighbors that Game Farm Road would be the bicycle path, and the intersection at Game Farm Road and Beltline closed off so traffic would not be coming down Game Farm Road. He asked the status of that issue. Mr. McKenney said that staff was discussing options with the neighbors and County, which had jurisdiction over the intersection. He added that he believed the intersection needed to be closed in some fashion; the issue was how, and where. Commissioner Beyer agreed, and hoped that would occur. He thought otherwise, a safety issue would arise on Game Farm Road. Mr. McKenney noted that PeaceHealth's modeling had assumed that the road would be closed at Beltline.

Commissioner Shaver believed that the closure would eliminate an alternative southern route, which was being heavily used now. He said there were three signals proposed for the road, which he thought would hamper through traffic. He said that it was difficult to time a signal for both directions. Mr. McKenney said that it helped when they were spaced out to the degree the proposed signals were, which were spaced over a distance of three city blocks in length. He noted that the TIA included an analysis of the signal synchronization along the arterial. Commissioner Shaver said he would like to see something in the master plan that "spelled that out." He was concerned about the potential installation of three "dumb" signals. Mr. McKenney pointed

out that there were competing needs in the area. If the City concentrated all the traffic from the development to one or two locations, the intersections would be very congested and the pavement would need to be much wider than was proposed. He said that currently, traffic was proposed to be diverted to three intersections, which seemed workable to staff.

Commissioner Shaver asked about the possibility of extending Mallard Street. Mr. McKenney said that staff had considered that, but the issue got back to the need to keep trips off Game Farm Road that should not be there. It was possible that in the long-term, Mallard Street would come through only in the eastbound direction when further development occurred.

Commissioner Shaver asked if there was anything in the master plan that discussed signal timing and the efficient movement of traffic. Mr. McKenney said that the Pioneer Parkway extension was a City project that would be built with or without the hospital. The City would design the project and operate the signals as appropriate. PeaceHealth was not involved.

Commissioner Carpenter asked about the impact of parking lot traffic from Building F onto Game Farm Road. Mr. McKenney said that the County was not supportive, and the issue would have to be resolved. He said that the question remained where access could occur. He noted that the building was proposed for the second phase of development, and staff and the applicant had time to work out the issue. Mr. McKenney pointed out that the 120 trips contemplated from the site, was not necessarily peak load or all employment-related trips. In addition, staff was not firm on where it thought the closure of Game Farm Road should be. It could be closed further to the south, and a little cul-de-sac created that accommodated the traffic going in and out of the site.

Mr. McKenney reported that the large parking structure at the existing Sacred Heart Hospital Hilyard campus accommodated 872 spaces, and he would provide the number for the other parking structure at a later date. Commissioner Beyer asked that the information be provided in writing so it was in the record.

Commissioner Moe scheduled the next commission meeting for October 28, 2003, at 6 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)