

MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission
Regular Session
Springfield City Hall--Jesse Main Room
225 Fifth Street--Springfield

November 1, 2005
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Steve Moe, Chair; Bill Carpenter, Vice Chair; David Cole. Greg Shaver

STAFF: Colin Stephens, Brenda Jones, Bill Grile and Gary Karp

CITY ATTORNEY: Joe Leahy

ABSENT: Lee Beyer, Frank Cross and Gayle Decker

Commissioner Carpenter called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
2. **REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION** – None
3. **BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None
4. **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING** –
 - a. **Springfield Development Code Amendment – Case Number LRP2005-00031, City of Springfield, Applicant -**

Gary Karp Senior Planner , addressed the Planning Commission with the amendment of the Springfield Development Code, specifically Article 23, Public Land and Open Space PLO, staff had started the review process at the Planning Commission Work Session. Mr. Karp believes that the review needs to continue a bit more at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Karp commented that no one is attending the Public Hearing, but would like to go through the criteria of approval. For amending the Springfield Development Code, Section 8.030 states, that reaching a decision on these actions, the Planning Commission and City Council shall adopt findings which demonstrate conformance with the following:

- Metro Plan and applicable State Statutes and applicable State wide Planning Goal and Administrative Rules.

The Staff report contains this. The issue at hand is going through the proposed text and looking

at the possible revision to that text. The Commission and Staff had gotten as far as height limitations and went back through the use list. To recap Mr. Karp understands of the use list we are going to add back senior centers, no final decision on changing fire stations, police stations/jails, public transit facilities and sports complexes and stadiums as to the discretionary use.

Commissioner Moe stated that those are very reasonable things to do and that is the consensus here and we it isn't done the City Council could get grief from very upset people.

Commissioner Carpenter is concerned that putting a ball field in a public park that it gets held up as a sports complex. Might need to define what a sports complex is. A single ball field would not constitute a sports complex. Six ball fields with lights would.

Colin Stephens asked if the commissioners concern was compatibility with surrounding residential uses. The commissioners responded yes. If there was PLO surrounded by commercial or industrial would the commissioners still like to see that as a discretionary use? They may want to comment about use.

Commissioner Moe stated the committee was pretty unanimous in that change. Mr. Stephens confirmed that it would be police stations/jails, fire stations, public transit facilities and sports complexes and stadiums. And senior (adult) activity centers would be added back in.

The next item on the list is the resolution of the height notification. I think resolution language suggested by City Attorney Leahy is excellent and I would be in support of that. Commissioner Carpenter stated he could probably live with it but I would hate see commercial treated differently than a building that is identically commercial but happens to be owned by the City. He feels strongly that there is a fairness issue here. On the other hand it is for a public purpose to save the taxpayer's money.

The resolution probably will be used only once and maybe not at all. Commissioner Moe added that staff has already been vested with the authority to make administrative variances for up to 30% in these distances so with that you are not going to have equal opportunity across the city anyway. You are going to have some discretion in staff to make things work.

Mr. Karp stated the next item was parking standards and it is pretty much the same thing as the Downtown Exception Area I explained before. The committee digressed to the previous item.

Commissioner Moe asked about low impact and high impact facilities. Commissioner Moe did not have definitions in front of him and they may already be defined. Mr. Stephens state they were in defined in Article 2. Commissioner Moe wants to make sure the Code defines specifically what these facilities are.

Mr. Stephens reviewed for the commissioners what the specific definitions for low and high impact facilities. There are no specific examples but it does give some guidance.

Mr. Karp added parking structures to that secondary use just in case there is ever a need for one.

Mr. Karp returned to parking standards. It simply adds language to the Downtown Exception Area and to put in some language that staff thought was clearer from Article 40 – Mixed Use. It does not change anything.

Mr. Karp addressed concerns about how the current barbwire fence standards could be interpreted. Staff has added language that barbwire could only be used for the outside storage of materials. It is prohibited in the exception area. From early discussions concerning the jail itself, there probably won't be any barbwire at that facility. Staff will include razor wire to the definition.

Commissioner Moe inquired about not having barbwire around the jail facility. Mr. Karp stated that staff had discussed the issue with police and the result was not barbwire around building due to the exercise area being internal.

Commissioners asked if the barbwire would be angled out, angled in or straight up. Mr. Stephens added that in the commercial zoning district under fences it says that the barbwire shall not extend into the vertical plane of adjoining public sidewalks and that language should be included. Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Karp moved on to special use standards. Not all of them are listed. Number 1 was kept and Number 4 was a revision of the particular section where the traffic impact studies are discussed in more detail. Subsection 9 is new and taken directly out of article 40 Mixed Use Standards. Because Downtown is nodal and we are looking at history and amenities as one of the nodal aspects of it, staff did not want to encumber the Downtown PLO district any more than necessary so number 1 and 9 would be pretty much what is proposed. What it does is have a list of acceptable amenities and based on the square footage of the building that is how many you need to have. There are also some guidelines as to how they are sited. It will apply to developments in the Downtown area that aren't zoned PLO because they are either going to be zoned Mixed Used Commercial and Mixed Use Residential.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if there were any pedestrian amenities that have excluded for the PLO that the other mixed use developments would have to do. Mr. Karp replied no.

Mr. Karp stated that street tree standards are normally 2 inch caliper. In the PLO, 3 inch calipers would be allowed to allow for larger trees in that area.

Commissioner Carpenter asked about number 7 and the one percent of the construction value of the project. The problem with that as the buildings get more and more expensive it precludes having some public art. Commissioner Shaver stated that there would be more public art. Commissioner Carpenter stated that then less of it tends to be visible to the public because the artwork can be inside or outside and this would require different places to put and he doesn't know if it would be useful to have this in the code. Commissioner Moe stated the one he thing would like to see is public art being incorporated into the building for example architectural treatments, more expensive facades as opposed to a funnel stuck in front of a building. I would much rather see a higher quality front of the building in the form of brick or granite or trees.

Discussion was held on what art was whether or not the front of the building or a separate piece of artwork is.

Mr. Stephens added that the developer had a list of eight different pedestrian amenities they could choose from based upon the size of the facility so it could be that they don't even choose to do that one. Commissioner Carpenter added that it is including but not limited to.

No testimony was given. Public testimony was closed.

Commissioner Shaver moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council the change in SDC Case No. LRP2005-00031 as amended by the directions provided to the staff by the Planning Commission in both the work session and regular session. Seconded by Commissioner Carpenter. No discussion. Motion carried.

5. **QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION** –

Commissioner Cole asked staff if there is anything in regards to Ballot Measure 37. Staff advised that we are still accepting claims however none have been filed.

6. **ADJOURN REGULAR**

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.