

## MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission  
Special Meeting  
Springfield City Hall–City Council Chambers  
225 Fifth StreetSpringfield

May 18, 2005  
6:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Steve Moe, Greg Shaver, Gayle Decker, Bill Carpenter, David Cole, Frank Cross, Springfield Planning Commission members; Joe Leahy, Springfield City Attorney; Greg Mott, City of Springfield; Susanna Julber, City of Springfield.

**ABSENT:** Lee Beyer, Springfield Planning Commission member

Commissioner Moe called the meeting to order.

**1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**3. REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION**

Commissioner Moe noted he attended the City Council meeting on May 16, 2005, and he spoke about his bike path concept in Glenwood. Greg Mott stated that the Council approved the Metro Plan public safety district amendment. Commissioner Moe also reported that the Council looked at a land use action on the two lots and the house that overlapped, and discussed how that happened.

**4. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Commissioner Moe noted there was no one present from the public who wished to address the Planning Commission.

**5. METRO PLAN DIAGRAM, GLENWOOD REFINEMENT PLAN DIAGRAM, GLENWOOD REFINEMENT PLAN TEXT, AND SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT**

Commissioner Moe addressed Planner Susanna Julber to speak on the continuation of deliberations on the proposed amendments.

Susanna Julber stated that this meeting is a continuation of the April 19, 2005, joint meeting with the Lane County Planning Commission. The record is closed, so public testimony and any items that were to be put into the public record are now closed. Susanna stated that the Commissioner's packets provided responses from staff to the questions that were asked of staff at the joint planning commission hearing, as well as responses to written comments that were received before the April 29 deadline for comments. Tonight just deliberating on the materials and making a recommendation to the City Council, who will hear the amendments on June 20.

Susanna explained that the previous night, the Lane County Planning Commission continued their deliberations, but could not make a recommendation to their Board because there wasn't a quorum. The deliberations have been rescheduled to June 7. Susanna explained that staff received 6 letters/ comments, and based on those comments there are some changes suggested, as follows:

- a) Incorporate the suggested changes under “Housekeeping Items”.
- b) Incorporate the revised language for proposed policy 4 of the Glenwood Refinement Plan and the proposed GR Plan District language found at SDC 44.030(b) to the following: .overall net residential density of at least 12 units/ acre.
- c) Incorporate the suggested height maximum of 90 feet within the GR Plan District, and the height maximum of 35 feet for development adjacent to the Willamette River. Although the maximum heights for development area determined by the underlying zoning districts (60 feet for MUC, 35 feet for MUR, and 45 feet for MUE), according to the language found at 44.100(8) provides that a developer can propose to exceed these height limits if they provide additional design amenities such as pedestrian amenities. Staff suggests adding language to this section so that “in no case can a development proposal exceed 90 feet in height”.

Additionally, staff recommends adding a requirement to the proposed language found at SDC 44.120 that implements a height maximum of 35 feet for development adjacent to the Willamette River. This requirement was provided in earlier versions of the GR Plan District language, but was omitted from the final version.

Commissioner Shaver asked about the meaning of “adjacent”. Susanna explained it means the first tier or layer of buildings next to the setback.

- d) Other issues that the Planning Commissions could consider include the following comments that were gleaned through conversations with citizens. Citizens recommended adding to the list of prohibited uses in the GR Plan District the following:
  - Wireless communications towers; and
  - Key/card lock fuel facilities.

Commissioner Moe suggested wireless communication towers could be within an existing building. Commissioner Shaver suggested revising the language slightly to say "free standing wireless communication towers".

Susanna added that one additional comment is to provide “accommodating transit” in the list of amenities for Franklin Blvd. such as sidewalks and bike lanes.

Commissioner Shaver inquired about guided bus ways and the need for them. Greg Mott clarified that the Council will make that determination on a policy regarding guided bus ways.

Susanna reported that at the Lane County Planning Commission meeting the previous evening, some of the Commissioners had comments regarding the proposed setback of 75 feet. Some felt it was not extensive enough. Some of the Commissioners also had concerns about whether to include Campus Industrial uses in the GR Plan District.

Commissioner Moe was concerned that we’d go back and forth on these separate recommendations. Greg Mott explained that the Planning Commissions can act independently, but the Board and Council needed to act in unison. Lane County Planning Commission is responsible to report to the Board, and the Springfield Planning Commission to the City Council.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if any of the restricted uses in the GR Plan District allowed in CI. Susanna said

that the list of uses allowed when your property is zoned CI defers to the MUE list of uses. Commissioner Carpenter asked about the moving and storage limitations. Greg explained that the allowance of a certain amount of support services pertains to a business park. The hearings official and city council heard it and directed staff to work on the CI district. Commissioner Carpenter asked if in the CI district, could something go in that uses volatile substances- he was concerned that if a user like that moves in first, it may be detrimental to subsequent uses. Generally, those that are in CI don't use those hugely volatile chemicals. Commissioner Carpenter was thinking more of a fumes/ pollutions issue. Greg stated that in CI, a use such as that would need to be fully enclosed and cannot omit those fumes. Greg stated that Lane County Planning Commissioners had similar concerns - the Springfield PC can certainly pass on a recommendation for taking the CI out. He elaborated that the site was small, and the economic studies indicated a strong residential/ commercial component, not specifically campus industrial. It is somewhat self-regulating. Commissioner Carpenter was concerned that an industrial user as the first one in, and that would scare away further residential and commercial.

Commissioner Cross asked about taking out CI. Susanna suggested that most of the campus-industrial type users we might want to see on the riverfront could go in under MUE (Mixed Use Employment zoning). She referred to the Springfield Development Code and verified that most of the CI uses were allowed in MUE. MUE allows some manufacturing, and some limited high tech manufacturing, research and development, testing facilities, indoor storage, etc. The Commissioners agreed that taking out the CI would be fine, because employment-oriented uses would be covered under MUE.

Commissioner Carpenter inquired about how the 90-foot height limit was determined. Commissioner Carpenter recommended that we revise that to 75 feet. Susanna answered that at 12 feet per story, this would allow 7-8 stories, which would be 84-96 feet, and the 90 feet was a rounded number. Commissioner Carpenter agreed that 90 feet was appropriate.

Commissioner Shaver inquired about undergrounding utilities. Susanna answered that undergrounding utilities is a big priority for Franklin Blvd., but that it isn't part of this particular project. It may be part of the Franklin Blvd. planning study.

Commissioner Carpenter inquired about the housekeeping items. Susanna verified that the housekeeping items were primarily typos and pagination problems.

Commissioner Carpenter moved that based on the record, the Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendments to the Metro Plan Diagram, concurrent Glenwood Refinement Plan Diagram, Glenwood Refinement Plan text amendments and the Springfield Development Code amendments as shown in the final order and in compliance with the criteria of approval section 7.070 and provisions of 7.110(4) and that the exhibits also be attached, with the suggested changes and the omission of Campus Industrial zoning from Article 44, and the change adding "free standing wireless communication towers".

Commissioner Cross seconded the motion.

**The motion passed, 6:0, (6 votes for, and 0 votes against.),**

## **6. BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR**

Bill Grile discussed the previous night's Budget Committee Meeting.

7. **BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION**

8. **ADJOURN REGULAR**

*(Recorded by Linda Kurtz, transcribed by Susanna Julber)*