

RESPONSES TO WRITTEN AND ORAL TESTIMONY

Since both the applicant and staff did not have an opportunity to rebut each topic of testimony before the March 27th Planning Commission public hearing was closed, it will occur here. These responses are intended to address all of the issues raised at the public hearing and the additional written comments received by staff as of April 3rd. The applicant prepared most of these responses. Staff concurs with the applicant's responses. In some cases staff has either completely answered or revised the applicant's response – these responses are marked as follows**. The applicant submitted formal rebuttal written materials by the April 10th date which can be found in Attachment 3.

The following people submitted written testimony entered into the record at the March 27th Planning Commission public hearing:

Jim and Brenda Wilson 2541 Marcola Road, received March 23, 2007
 Darlene Houck 2595 Marcola Road, received March 26, 2007
 Rick Satre*, received March 26, 2007

*This was a response to issues raised by the Department of Land Conservation and Development in a letter dated March 12th. The Satre response stands on its own.

The following people presented oral testimony at the March 27th Planning Commission public hearing:

Karen Boden, 2187 N. 32nd Street
 Peggy Thompson, 2777 Marcola Road
 Gayle Wagenblast, 2457 Otto Street
 Cheri Willis, 2476 Otto Street
 Robert Lind, 2359 31st Street
 Nancy Falk, 2567 Marcola Road
 Lauri Segal, representing Goal 1 Coalition, 642 Charnelton Street, Eugene
 Jennifer Bates, representing the Ambleside Homeowner's Association, 2287 35th Street
 Karen Clearwater, 2361 31st Street

The following people submitted written testimony by the April 3rd deadline granted by the Planning Commission after two persons requested the written record to be left open for seven days:

Gayle Wagenblast, 2457 Otto Street
 Nancy Falk, 2567 Marcola Road
 Cheri Willis, 2476 Otto Street
 Wesley Swanger 2415 Marcola Road

For ease of review all neighbor testimony, both written and oral have been combined in this format which responds to each question and/or topic.

Name	Summary of Testimony	Response
Karen Boden Gayle Wagenblast	1. The impact to the established neighboring homes and the quality of the proposed homes.	With the trip cap, there is no significant difference in the number of dwellings or the traffic that will result from these changes. For properties directly abutting, zoning of the project site will remain the same for all but seven lots, for a total distance of approximately 630 feet on the perimeter.
Karen Boden Gayle	2. The impact on Briggs and Yolanda schools. Yolanda	The school system as a whole has sufficient capacity for additional

Wagenblast Cheri Willis Jennifer Bates	Elementary School has large class sizes now and Briggs Middle School has children doubled up in lockers currently.	students. Districts can be redrawn to avoid overcrowding. Despite the 19-acre increase of MDR land, the maximum number of dwellings under the amendment's proposed trip-cap will be only 16 more than permitted under the current designation and zone. The school district uses an estimating ratio of 39 students per 100 new single-family homes and 21 students per 100 new multi-family dwelling. At maximum densities, the estimated impact of the amendment will be only 6 additional students. See also the letter from School District 19 in Attachment 3.
Karen Boden	3. If the proposed development would require annexation of nearby properties.	**No. The subject site is entirely within the current city limits. The City does not have a policy to force annexation of properties that are adjacent to the city limits. The City's annexation process applies when new subdivisions are proposed on land outside the city limits.
Kathy Boden Gayle Wagenblast	4. What would happen to wildlife that live in and/or use the open field?	The issue raised here will be the same whether or not zoning is changed. It is better dealt with during the Master Plan phase where site planning and drainage will be addressed.
Kathy Boden Gayle Wagenblast	5. Drainage issues. There is flooding to abutting properties the west and to the north.	**Grading and drainage plans will be reviewed with the Master Plan and later applications. They must be prepared by Oregon licensed engineers and their work reviewed by the City's Public Works Department. Increasing drainage to adjacent properties is not permitted.
Kathy Boden	6. Mapping error – 23 rd Street should be Bonnie Lane.	**The mapping error has been resolved for future maps.
Peggy Thompson Jim and Brenda Wilson Wesley Swanger	7. Increased traffic caused by the development/difficulty backing onto Marcola Road from existing houses across the street.	The application has been reviewed by traffic engineers from State and the City for compliance with all of the statutory requirements. As proposed, the amendment will not result in any more traffic than would be produced by development under the current designation and zone.
Peggy Thompson	8. Asked if a round-about could be constructed at 28 th Street and Marcola Road.	At this time, the <i>TransPlan</i> does not anticipate a round-about for this intersection.
Gayle Wagenblast Cheri Willis Nancy Falk Jennifer Bates Karen	9. Medium Density Residential density questions – if the minimum density is 10 dwelling units per acre, why are they required to have 12 dwelling units per acre and why can't	<i>TransPlan</i> identifies the site as a potential Nodal Development Area. The proposed amendment would implement the Nodal Area designation raising the minimum density to 12 du/acre, and help the City meet State

Clearwater	they rezone to a lower density/at the public hearing the planner mentioned that the Master Plan could include 20 homes per acre.	transportation requirements. With or without Nodal Area designation, the MDR maximum remains 20du/acre. Rezoning to a lower density will make it more difficult for the City to meet the <i>Metro Plan's</i> target overall density and comply with Statewide Planning Goals.
Cheri Willis Clayton "Joe" Willis	10. Extra persons on the bike path and crime (houses and cars broken into).	The issue raised here will be the same whether or not zoning is changed. The principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) suggest encouraging persons or activities to maximize surveillance possibilities. Improvement and maintenance of the bike path will increase natural surveillance and possibly reduce crime.
Robert Lind	11. Wanted to have the two and three story apartments placed in another spot.	**Apartments could be built there today. The issue raised here is the same whether or not zoning is changed. The SDC allows a maximum building height of 35 feet in the MDR District. The height issue is better dealt with during the Master Plan phase where design standards, site planning and landscaping will be addressed.
Robert Lind	12 How is 31 st Street going to be improved and will this cost be placed on the current property owners?	**There are Improvement Agreements that encumber a number of properties on the east side of 31 st Street. 31 st Street is a Collector Street. City policy has been that if a Local Improvement District is required, then properties would be assessed as if they fronted a Local Street. No decision will be made concerning street improvements and possible assessments until the Master Plan application is submitted to the City.
Nancy Falk	13. This is a special piece of property and that a number of developers have tried to locate on this property without success.	Past proposals have been piecemeal. The proposed amendment will bring 100 acres under a comprehensive Master Plan. Future proceedings to approve that Master Plan and specific site plans will afford neighbors many opportunities to express their concerns.
Nancy Falk Wesley Swanger	14. The Planning Commission should not amend the Metro Plan/Rezoning or departure from the current Metro Plan will only encourage additional conversion to commercial and set a precedent.	The <i>Springfield Commercial Lands Study</i> found a serious shortage of commercially zoned property. Conversion to commercial zoning is exactly what is needed to achieve the overall goals of the <i>Metro Plan</i> regarding equitable land supply.
Lauri Segal	15. There are internal inconsistencies with Type I, II, III and IV review processes.	**Although the terminology is confusing, the application and staff report are correct in stating the

		proposed action is a Type II <i>Metro Plan</i> amendment, subject to a Type IV review process. The Type II process is one that was adopted by all three local jurisdictions which required similar language for Metro Plan amendments in 1987. The Type I-IV review process was unique to Springfield at that time.
Lauri Segal Nancy Falk	16. Goal 2 was not adequately addressed/Goal 2 states that revisions to the Metro Plan should not be made more often than every two years. Just recently Springfield made major revisions to the Metro plan for Peace Health at River Bend.	**The applicant has addressed the Goal 2 question (see Attachment 3 – correspondence from James Spickerman). In addition review procedures in SDC has no limitation on the number of Metro Plan amendments that may be submitted. Each application stands on its own. Specifically, SDC 7.010 states that Metro Plan amendments can be "...initiated at any time." Additionally, the Riverbend <i>Metro Plan</i> diagram amendment was initiated in 2002 and was approved by the City Council January 10, 2005.
Lauri Segal	17. Goal 5 – The City's Natural Resource Study was not an update of the City's land inventories, the loss of land involved small acreages pertaining to the 25 foot setbacks.	The adopted and acknowledged <i>Springfield Natural Resource Study Report</i> included an analysis of how proposed Goal 5 actions would affect land inventories. This analysis required updating estimates of land supplies. These updates considered only designation changes and other actions that were adopted and acknowledged. They are, therefore, the most recent and accurate land supply estimates available. Because the <i>Springfield Natural Resource Study Report</i> is acknowledged by the DLCD, it can be used.
Lauri Segal	18. Goal 9 – Staff cited an outdated version of the OAR.	**The application was submitted in September 2006 prior to the effective date of changes made to Goal 9 by DLCD.
Lauri Segal	19. Recreational needs were not adequately addressed.	A portion of the Pierce property was already designated Park and Open Space in a previous City action (95-02-36) and dedicated for a public park. Park development fees will be assessed with building permits. The applicant has met with EWEB and Willamalane Parks officials to discuss coordination of planning and development. The proposed Master Plan includes extensive open spaces. Goal 8 requirements are fully addressed in the proposed findings. Recreational needs have been and will

		be adequately addressed.
Jennifer Bates Karen Clearwater	20. Safety issues for children crossing 31 st Street at V Street.	Public improvements (including streets, crosswalks, traffic signals and vision clearance) are addressed during the Master Plan, Site Plan Review and Subdivision process.
Nancy Falk	21. We (homes on the south side of Marcola Road) will be the most adversely harmed by this proposed development with intrusion of streets with traffic signals and the backs of retail stores on and parking lots directly across from our homes.	The issues raised here will be the same whether or not zoning is changed. They are better dealt with during the Master Plan phase where design standards, site planning and landscaping will be addressed.
Clayton "Joe" Willis	22. People should be forced to financially compensate the City for the negative impact they will have on our community.	Developers and builders are required to mitigate traffic impacts and pay system development fees based on the magnitude of their impacts.
Clayton "Joe" Willis	23. A "Final Master Plan" should be required prior to any zoning changes.	***Master Plans, Site Reviews and Subdivisions can only be based on existing zoning. These applications require the zoning to be consistent with the Metro Plan designation.
Gayle Wagenblast	24. Change the Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential to resolve the density issue, the impact on schools and the drainage issues.	The proposed density is no greater than under the current designation and zoning. Rezoning to a lower density will make it more difficult for the City to meet the <i>Metro Plan's</i> and <i>Trans Plan's</i> target overall density and comply with Statewide Planning Goals.
Jim and Brenda Wilson Wesley Swanger	25. Big trucks would be delivering freight at all hours of the night/noise in general.	The issue raised here will be the same under the current designation and zoning. Operating hours can be dealt with during the Master Plan phase.
Jim and Brenda Wilson	26. Our view of the Coburg Hills would be almost completely blocked off by unsightly buildings. Anything over one story high along Marcola Road would be considered too high. I would like to see the businesses spaced at an appropriate space so they would be appealing to our eyes.	**The issue raised here will be the same whether or not zoning is changed. In fact, SDC 21.080(1) states the maximum height in the CI District (current zoning) is 45 feet. The building height issue is better dealt with during the Master Plan phase where design standards, site planning and landscaping will be addressed.