

## MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission  
Work Session  
Springfield City Hall—Jesse Maine Room  
225 Fifth Street, Springfield

June 5, 2007  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Frank Cross, Chair; Bill Carpenter Vice Chair, Steve Moe, Gayle Decker, Lee Beyer, David Cole, Johnny Kirschenmann, members; Greg Mott, Mark Metzger, Gary Karp, Gary McKenney, Kitti Gale, Andy Limbird, Dave Reesor, Carole Knapel, Mike Harmon and Police Chief Jerry Smith, Springfield staff; Joe Leahy, City Attorney

Commissioner Cross called the meeting to order.

### 1. WORK SESSION

#### a. Site Review for St. Vincent de Paul of Lane County (DRC2007-0024)

Ms. Gale said the application involved a multi-unit structure with 55 units. She called attention to architectural renderings and a site plan of the proposed development. Residents would go through a screening process and there would be an on-site manager. The development would include parking, storage facilities, and community rooms. St. Vincent de Paul would pay to have the street improved. There was sufficient room for emergency access.

Ms. Gale said there were some areas in the proposal where the applicant was requesting concessions to the code. In addition, she had received 24 letters from neighbors expressing concern about the development, so staff decided to bring the decision to the commission. That would give the neighbors an additional way to voice their concerns.

Ms. Gale referred to the staff report, and said it appeared the primary concern for neighbors was traffic. Others were concerned about the safety of children using the road as a playground. She noted the history of S Street and said there was nothing unusual about it. Mr. McKenney was available to answer questions about the traffic study. His examination of the application indicated that street system could accommodate the traffic to be generated by the development with no need for stop signs or traffic lights.

Ms. Gale referred to the conditions proposed for the development, which indicated areas to be resolved by the commission, including the category for the development as it related to parking. She said that multi-unit development required 1.5 parking spaces per unit. St. Vincent de Paul had provided information

about its other senior developments, and it indicated they did not include much parking. For example, there were as few as 30 parking spaces for a 250-unit structure in Eugene. She had concluded the development could have as little as .25 spaces per unit, but the agency chose to have one parking space per unit for a total of 55. Ms. Gale noted the inclusion of a community garden space on the site plan and suggested it was possible to use that space for parking. However, it did not appear there was a need for more than one space per unit. She recommended the commission accept the adequacy of the parking.

Speaking to concerns expressed by the neighbors about the potential conversion of the development from a senior complex, Ms. Gale reported that the St. Vincent de Paul was working under grant restrictions that forbid such conversions for a minimum of 40 years.

Ms. Gale noted that the proposed structure was seven inches higher than the code allowed to accommodate the elevator, and she recommended that be accommodated.

Speaking to the storage spaces, Ms. Gale said St. Vincent de Paul proposed to reduce the size of outdoor storage because additional closet space, extra bicycle parking, and a community room were being included. There was storage space for every apartment outside the apartment, however.

Ms. Gale noted the Fire Department's recommendation for no parking on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street until it was constructed to a 36 foot width, which was a concern to the residents. She said an added concern was the impact of construction. The construction contractor would be present at the hearing to answer questions and to describe his plans for addressing it.

Ms. Gale noted concerns expressed by residents regarding the loss of property values, which she could not speak to. However, she noted the zoning pattern in the neighborhood and said it had not changed for decades. She emphasized with those who purchased properties thinking that the vacant parcels nearby were not going to be developed, but they were. Ms. Gale noted the potential that the development of undeveloped properties in the area would result in the extension of S Street. St. Vincent de Paul would improve the frontage of its property. She noted the right-of-way owned by the City. She acknowledged the neighbors' concern that the street was not fully built, but that was the way development worked and the street improvements could not be forced on the owners of the undeveloped properties.

Commissioner Beyer asked how staff addressed the garbage issues raised by neighbors. Ms. Gale explained that the trash would be enclosed in a small building. Commissioner Beyer asked if thought was given to moving it to the east side of the parcel. Ms. Gale said that the garage location would not work in front of the building, although perhaps it could be moved behind the building. However, if there was excessive noise from the garage, the properties to the east and south would be potentially affected. She did not think there would be excessive noise or odors. She said the garbage had been sited in a location setback properly and it would not be in an open area.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the properties shown in green on the map were

owned by the applicant. Ms. Gale said no. Commissioner Carpenter asked why the properties were shown on the map. Ms. Gale did not know. Mr. McKenney indicated the properties in question were vacant. Mr. Metzger pointed out the areas slated for future development on the map.

Commissioner Carpenter asked how the traffic analysis would be changed if the application was for a 55 unit apartment complex. Ms. Gale deferred to Mr. McKenney. Mr. McKenney said that he would have to check; he believed it was about six trips per day per unit.

Commissioner Carpenter confirmed with Ms. Gale that the property was located both on high-density and medium-density land, and the two lots had been combined. The entire development met the combined densities of the two parcels. The development did not exceed the densities for the two zones. She indicated she would provide more detail at the public hearing.

Commissioner Carpenter said the site appeared to be 50 feet from 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and suggested that the property owner could acquire that property and construct a driveway onto 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Gale said St. Vincent de Paul had looked into alternative accesses without success.

Commissioner Carpenter expressed concern about placing a 55-unit apartment house on a dead-end residential street. He suggested the traffic count information was outdated and a 62 year old person in 2007 were not the same as a 62 year old person in 1980 or 1990. He was also concerned the parking was inadequate, and about the elimination of the parking on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, which would force parking on S Street. He did not think those concerns had been adequately addressed.

Ms. Gale pointed out that the development was both a senior development and a low-income development. St. Vincent de Paul had provided statistics from its other projects demonstrating that those people did not have automobiles.

Commissioner Cross asked if the City had any information beyond what the agency had provided on the habits of senior citizens. Ms. Gale said no.

**b. Vacation of Public Right-of-Way—City of Springfield/Springfield Police Department (LRP2007-00019)**

Mr. Limbird introduced the item. He recalled the other planning approvals that occurred to facilitate the construction of the Justice Center. The application in question was to vacate B Street to enable secure parking for police vehicles and also for construction of a single-story ancillary building that would contain equipment and evidence.

Commissioner Beyer asked if there had been any discussion about going east for the parking rather than closing B Street. He also asked about possibly moving the ancillary building across the street. Police Chief Smith said there had been discussion of other options, but the options that were discussed had been much more expensive. He reminded the commission that when the City went to the voters with the bond measure, the bond campaign mentioned the possible closure of streets and the acquisition of property. He emphasized the operational

efficiencies that would be gained by having the functions in the Justice Center contiguous to one another, and the safety issue associated with closing B Street.

With respect to the jail, Chief Smith pointed out the need for an evacuation plan, and if B Street remained open there would be no secure area to which to evacuate people to. Removing the ancillary building across the street would mean the building was not secured and it was a major target for vandalism, as was the police fleet.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer regarding the type of fencing to be installed, Chief Smith anticipated that the facility would be surrounded by something aesthetically pleasing, such as wrought iron.

Mr. Limbird called the commission's attention to the testimony received to date.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Decker, Mr. Limbird said the alley at the north end of the property was a paved alley that would remain open to the public. He noted that staff had provided information regarding the distances people would have to travel to circulate around the development on a diagram included in the packet.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer, Mr. Limbird confirmed that Lane Transit District (LTD) buses currently used B Street. He pointed out nearby bus stops. Commissioner Beyer asked where the buses would go. Mr. Limbird believed buses would travel up A Street and LTD had already made preliminary plans to change the route to accommodate construction phasing.

Commissioner Beyer referred to the commercial property on the corner of B and 4<sup>th</sup> streets and asked if the owner had offered any comment. Mr. Limbird said no. He pointed out that the business in question was a veterinary surgery and it did not generate much traffic.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if there had been thought given to closing the alley to vehicles to prevent pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. Mr. Limbird said that had not been discussed. Mr. Metzger noted that there were other properties that derived access from the alley. Commissioner Carpenter asked if a sidewalk could be added to the alley. Mr. Limbird did not think there would be room for a sidewalk.

Mr. Limbird noted the signage that would be provided to direct people to the Justice Center and to avoid encroachment on the residential neighborhood. Commissioner Beyer asked where someone going to the courts would park. Mr. Limbird said they could park on 4<sup>th</sup> Street or along the south side of B Street. Chief Smith said that currently, people also parked on A Street. He did not expect a lot of additional demand in the form of trips to the Justice Center when it was completed, particularly during the day time hours. There might be more trips at night.

Commissioner Carpenter clarified with Chief Smith that the structures to be constructed on the site were completely funded.

Responding to a question from Mr. Cole, Mr. Limbird said the code did not provide numeric standards for block length but called for reasonably direct routes of travel, which was why he provided the diagram illustrating likely traffic patterns resulting from the closure.

Commissioner Beyer asked Mr. McKenney to confirm his suspicion that once the street was closed, the traffic would be pushed onto A Street. Mr. McKenney believed that people coming to the Justice Center from outside downtown would adjust their driving patterns and choose other routes entirely. Those trips originating closer to the center would likely travel to the intersection of B Street and turn. He estimated about approximately 150 trips would be diverted each day, but that was assuming that people would drive right to the closed street and then make a decision; he thought that many people would choose a new route well before they got to the area.

Commissioner Beyer suggested that someone coming into downtown from Eugene would probably turn on A Street, and if coming from the other direction they would probably turn on E Street. Mr. McKenney agreed.

**c. Metro Plan/Refinement Plan Map Amendment and a Concurrent Zone Mao Amendment; Journal Number ZON2007-00012 and LRP20047-00013**

Mr. Reesor provided the staff report. He called attention to the two applications before the commission, noting the zone change was submitted concurrently to forward Peace Health's goal of building a medical office on the site. The proposal involved two parcels on Main Street, one of which was developed commercially. The applicant proposed to change the zoning from LMI (Light-Medium Industrial) to CC (Community Commercial).

Mr. Reesor called attention to a map showing the zoning of the property.

Mr. Reesor noted the State Planning Goals relevant to the applications, Goal 12 (Transportation) and Goal 9 (Economic Development). In regard to Goal 12, Mr. Reesor said staff evaluated the impact of the proposal on existing transportation facilities. The applicant had submitted a traffic impact analysis (TIA), which was reviewed by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff and Springfield staff. He said that staff looked at the reasonable worst case scenario that would be created by the zone change, and as a result had recommended a trip cap of 243 trips a day as a condition of approval. Commissioner Decker asked what happened when the cap was exceeded. Mr. McKenney said the City estimated what it believed the property would generate in regard to trips in a reasonable worst case with the current and proposed zone, and the requirement of Goal 12 was met if the City determined that the change would not make traffic any worse.

Commissioner Beyer thought it was odd the City was talking about constraining density on a parcel in the middle of the city on a major arterial. Mr. McKenney said the City's objective was that its transportation and land use plans be in harmony and balanced; if it wished to rezone property and allow a substantially greater amount of traffic to be generated from the property than anticipated by existing plans, it ran into a Goal 12 issue and must demonstrate there was no significant effect.

Regarding Goal 9, Mr. Reesor noted the references in the staff report to the 1992 Industrial Lands Study, Commercial Lands Study, and Goal 5 inventory, and the conclusions related to the excess of industrial lands and shortage of commercial lands, which led staff to conclude that the application was consistent with Goal 9. Mr. Metzger reported that he had met with the former property owners a year ago, and they had asked him about the possibility of rezoning the parcel as commercial given the difficulty they were having rent space in the industrial park they already had. They believed there was an oversupply of industrial land.

**d. Amendment and Reformat of the Springfield Development Code—Journal Number LRP2007-00015**

Mr. Karp provided the staff report, reminding the commission the amendments were the final product of a two-year process. He called attention to Attachment 3, a list of potential policy issues and text revisions that staff would be considering soon and which the commission would also discuss. He invited questions.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Karp clarified that the code included some minor text revisions to clarify some things but there were no substantive changes.

Commissioner Beyer asked if the reviewers on the Planning staff found the revised code easier to use. Mr. Karp said yes. Commissioner Beyer asked if staff sought outside review. Mr. Karp said no, although staff solicited ideas for changes or suggestions from users of the code prior to the revisions. He thought more significant changes, such as a shift to a form based code, would require outside review. He noted that the code had not been changed for some time and it was likely to take users time to get used to the changes.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cross, Mr. Karp believed there was time for the commission to review the code and get back to him with its concerns prior to the time the council took action.

Commissioners Moe and Decker commended the work of Mr. Karp.

Commissioner Cross adjourned the meeting at 7 p.m.

(Recorded by Brenda Jones; Transcribed by Kimberly Young)