

City of Springfield
Work Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION HELD
Tuesday, March 27, 2007

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in Work Session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon on **Tuesday, March 27, 2007 at 5:30 p.m.**, with Frank Cross as Springfield Planning Commission Chair.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Chair Frank Cross, Planning Commissioners Lee Beyer, Gayle Decker, Dave Cole, Steve Moe and Johnny Kirschenmann. Also present were Development Service Director Bill Grile, Planning Manager Greg Mott, Planning Supervisor Mark Metzger, Planner III Gary Karp, Planning Secretary Brenda Jones, and City Attorney Joe Leahy.

ABSENT

- Bill Carpenter

APPLICATIONS

**1. METRO PLAN DIAGRAM AMEMDMENT—CASE NUMBER LRP 2006-00027
SPRINGFIELD ZONING MAP AMENDMENT—CASE NUMBER ZON 2006-
00054**

Commissioner Cross called the meeting to order. He briefly noted the applications at hand.

Mr. Karp made the staff presentation, explaining that the property in question was known as the Pierce property was sold last year and the new property owners wanted to develop the property to allow construction of a phased mixed use residential and commercial development with nodal attributes to be known as the Village at Marcola Meadows. The property located north of Marcola Road and west of 31st, was about 100 acres in size. The current Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General Area Plan (Metro Plan) designation for the property was Campus Industrial, Medium-Density Residential, and Campus Industrial. Mr. Karp said the applicant was requesting a Type II Metro Plan amendment to change the Campus Industrial portion of the site (56 acres) to Commercial/Nodal Development Area, Community Commercial, and Medium-Density Residential/Nodal Development Area, and an amendment to the Springfield Zoning Map from Campus Industrial to Community Commercial (11 acres), Mixed Use Commercial (26 acres), and Medium-Density Residential (19 acres).

Mr. Karp said the applications were the first step in the process of obtaining development review approval. Submittal of a master plan regulating development on the entire parcel would require approval of the Planning Commission and individual site review and subdivision applications. Future applications would include public notice.

Mr. Karp reported that the applicant held a public meeting at Briggs Middle School on March 14 to discuss the proposal with residents and solicit their questions and concerns. About 40 people attended, and concern was expressed about the effect of drainage from the site, whether adjacent residents would have to participate in street improvement costs, and building height. Most of those issues raised were related to the master plan approval process, where such issues would be addressed. He said if such issues were raised at the public hearing, they would be included in the public record, but they were not related to the criteria governing the applications.

Mr. Karp spoke to Statewide Planning Goal 12, Transportation. The Pierce property was listed in TransPlan as a potential node and was considered by the City Council for formal designation as a node. The applicant submitted a request for a trip cap, to be implemented through a trip monitoring plan to demonstrate compliance with Goal 12. Springfield staff Gary McKenney and Ed Walker of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) reviewed the application for compliance and recommended a condition of approval to be imposed during the master plan review process. The condition called for ramp improvements at the Mohawk/Eugene-Springfield Highway interchange.

Mr. McKenney spoke to the traffic analysis, saying Springfield and ODOT staff were satisfied that the analysis was accurate and adequate. In regard to the zone change, traffic engineers must make assumptions about the type of development that would occur, and they focus on the intensity to be expected in a “reasonable worst case development scenario.” The result was measured against the Goal 12 criteria and compared to what had been assumed would take place. Mr. McKenney said the engineers looked at the trips anticipated in the “reasonable worst case scenario” and built a structure into the land use approval process that precluded further development after the traffic generated by the proposed development reached a certain lid. He reminded the commission that was the approach taken to the Peace Health plan amendment.

Continuing, Mr. McKenney said one concern about such an approach was that the first phases of a development could take up all the capacity under the lid, making later phases more problematic and potential leaving empty land. He said the condition of approval recommended took a different approach. Staff recommended that within each zone in the proposal, the number of units of development, whether thousands of square feet of commercial or number of units of residential, be limited.

Mr. McKenney said that another issue that staff addressed through a condition of approval related to the impact that would result from development under the proposed rezoning. The draft analysis identified one facility that would be significantly affected if the development proceeded as proposed, the Mohawk interchange with the freeway,

particularly the eastbound off-ramp. The applicant proposed to mitigate the impact through some lane restriping. Staff was comfortable with that conceptually, but at this point lacked a detailed design that could be analyzed. He recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant demonstrate to ODOT, the facility owner, that the mitigation measure could be accomplished meeting the applicable ODOT highway standards.

Commissioner Cross asked when mitigation would occur. Mr. McKenney said it would be required to be in place prior to the occupancy of any new building on the site. The restriping would create an additional turn lane. No changes were needed at the other on-ramp. Responding to a follow-up question from Commissioner Decker, Mr. McKenney indicated that the analysis looked 15 years into the future.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cross, Mr. McKenney said the interchange to the east was not expected to handle most of the traffic coming from the east. The 42nd Street interchange was not as close and was not the primary route people chose to use. Staff believed that most people would choose to use the interchange closest to the site, and the Mohawk exchange was closest. He confirmed, in response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Cross, that the center turn would be able to go both straight and left; today one could not go to the left. There would be two lanes from which people could make a left turn.

Mr. Karp spoke to the issue of compliance with Statewide Goal 9, Economic Development. He said that in 2001, the City Council denied a Metro Plan amendment to change 7.79 acres of Campus Industrial to Community Commercial to accommodate a Home Depot. He noted the applicant submitted the applications in September 2006, prior to the effective date of the recent changes of Goal 9, Commercial and Industrial Lands Study from 2001, are still the ones in effect today. The recently adopted Natural Resource Study fine tuned the Commercial and Industrial Land Inventories. What we haven't had is a complete review of the main inventories. There may be a future Commercial/Industrial Buildable Lands Study, which will be outside the realm of this project. There are still only two Campus Industrial sites in the community, one is at Gateway and the other is the Pierce property. The draft Jasper-Natron Specific Development Plan proposes to add to the Campus Industrial Inventory, but it was yet to be adopted.

Mr. Karp discussed what had changed since 2001, saying that in regard to the Campus Industrial zone, there appeared to be growing demand for business park uses. The zoning district was primarily intended to be an industrial zoning district, and in 2004 the City made some changes to the mix of uses to ensure that 60 percent was dedicated to industrial/research and 40 percent could accommodate business parks. That applied to the Pierce site. However, most of the demand happening on the Gateway Campus Industrial site was for commercial office uses. Mr. Karp said this staff report included a list of 20-25 uses currently at that site. There was one industrial use, Shorewood Packaging, and the remainder was developed in such uses as call centers or business parks.

Mr. Karp believed there was a change in the nature of the demand since the adoption of the Campus Industrial designation. The Sony plant siting was an example of the type of use that was contemplated; that use lasted about five years and became obsolete. The Sony building was now in use for medical research.

Mr. Karp suggested the lack of Campus Industrial development on the Pierce site was due to the relative proximity of the Kingsford Charcoal plant, the rail line, and electric lines. He said the Home Depot application was for a piecemeal development and the proposal in question was for the entire property.

Mr. Karp said the commission's decision needed to consider whether the City would be better served by the application. He believed that a quality development would be constructed in time.

Commissioner Beyer believed the commission faced the qualitative decision of whether it was better to put the site into more commercial use. He recalled his past arguments for Campus Industrial zoning on the site, but disagreed with Mr. Karp's assessment that there had been no interest expressed in locating an industrial use on the property. He had worked with several people, some of who went so far as to develop site plans, who tried to locate an industrial use on the property but they had did not have a willing seller. However, he thought the commission needed to focus on the best use of the property. Mr. Karp said he did not disagree with Commissioner Beyer's assessment.

Commissioner Cross recalled that there were other issues related to the suitability of the property. Mr. Karp noted the previously mentioned proximate uses, which were not acceptable for some uses such as high tech industrial uses because of noise, vibration, and pollution.

Mr. Metzger agreed with Commissioner Beyer, and said that other issues, particularly the Kingsford plant, worked against the site as high tech location.

Commissioner Beyer thought there was also a perception of transportation problems at the site and agreed about Mr. Metzger's assessment of the Kingsford site. He thought there was also a perception related to power lines and the vibration from rail lines, but pointed out that many high tech sites in Oregon were in located on similarly hampered sites and while it was a concern, it did not preclude such uses from being located on those sites.

Commissioner Cross asked if the proposed use could be sited at another location if it was not to be accommodated at this site.

Mr. Mott said the State, through the periodic review process, did not order the City to evaluate its industrial land from either the demand or supply side, and no one had analyzed what the community was able to offer that sector of the economy, making it difficult to compete for those businesses. Over time, Springfield had experienced a change in what types of businesses were attracted to the community, and the City Council

had not yet discussed how to position Springfield for those businesses. The State required the City to have a 20-year inventory, but did not stipulate in the past the type of analysis that would legitimize the inventory in terms of both quantity and the usability of the sites for different sectors of the economy.

Mr. Mott suggested a manufacturing business might not be as concerned with a supply of developable acres as it was with the quality of life, high educational quality, and better medical facilities, and might compromise on the quality of the site it selected for those factors. Springfield staff expected to engage in a discussion of that topic with the council and the community at the start of the next fiscal year. At this point, he believed the City was operating under antiquated notions about the industrial sector was and what it could be expected to be in the future, and had done no analysis or planning outside of a few discrete actions, such as the implementation of the urban renewal district in Glenwood and the draft Jasper-Natron Specific Development Plan.

Mr. Mott said the law was clear as to the need for a 20-year inventory, but it was not clear that the expectation was that the 20-year would be a rolling inventory, that is, there would always be a 20-year supply. While it was impractical to think there would be, he believed the City needed to evaluate what was needed, perhaps on five-year cycles. Periodic deletions of the inventory had some affect, but he did not think the overall significance of that could be determined until a cyclical evaluation occurred.

Mr. Beyer suggested that Commissioner Cross' question was, if not here, where, within Springfield, and was that a concern. He said he both agreed and disagreed with Mr. Mott. He said in reality, communities do not count units and then factor in projection growth and density factors to determine how much land was needed; instead, reality was opportunity-based. He hoped that staff commissioned some commercial and industrial brokers to review the existing inventory and how it related to regional demand, as he believed that demand was more regional in nature than local. Mr. Beyer also hoped that staff talked to the State Economic Development Department to learn what kinds of requests for land it was receiving.

It was Commissioner Beyer's perception that the metropolitan area had no land, even for local growth. He offered as an example the growth occurring in Coburg, which he attributed to a lack of land in the metropolitan area. He pointed out that 3,000 to 5,000 people were working each day in a town with a population of 800 only 1-1/2 miles from Springfield's border. That was where the land was, and the metropolitan area was now grappling with what to do with the sewer from the growth Coburg experienced. He said the issue was where were the sites available that people wanted to use, adding it was questionable whether the site in question was a good industrial site and perhaps better used for housing. However, Commissioner Beyer questioned whether the City should change the zone because of a lack of need for the land, and questioned if the commission had the information it needed to make that judgment.

Mr. Mott clarified he was not suggesting that he and Mr. Metzger were going to commence on an industrial lands study on July 1; the budget allocation he anticipated

would be used to hire professionals. He said the commission did not need to substitute the site for another site; it was not an approval criterion or a requirement of Goal 9. However, the commission needed to respond to the effect of the proposal on the inventory, and the effect on the inventory would be reduction of 56 acres of Campus Industrial from the inventory.

Commissioner Cross questioned how the commission could justify the proposal as beneficial to Springfield if it was unable to understand the true benefit behind it.

Mr. Mott noted that the commission had yet to hear all the evidence. He pointed out that any time the City made such a change anywhere it was replacing one designation for another. He suggested the same questions with respect to the appropriateness of the site for the intended use, not just the existing use. He said the commission had to assume, because it lacked evidence to the contrary, that the City made the right decision at some point in the past to designate the sites as they were, as it had all worked out in the past and the infrastructure was designed around what was intended for the site. As time passed and policies became dated or the appropriateness of the site passes by for whatever reason, there was an initiative to change the property's designation and the developers made that argument to the City. The commission had to weigh the facts and whether the policies in the plan supported the action.

Mr. Mott reiterated that the commission did not have to make up the reduction in the designation somewhere else, although that might occur through another process.

Mr. Metzger reported that Department of Land Conservation and Development staff had indicated its preference that the City's staff report be based on adopted inventories that were currently part of the record. The most recent industrial inventory was done in 1992, and it had suggested that there would be 1,500 to 2,100 surplus acres beyond the 20-year supply. The State directed the City to evaluate the reduction against the surplus, rather than the 20-year supply itself, and suggested that if the City "nibbled away" at the surplus it should theoretically be okay. The finding was that 56 acres could be accommodated against the surplus.

Mr. Metzger recalled Springfield's 2000 Commercial Lands Study, which found the community short of supply by about 356 acres. The City had added to the projected shortfall through other actions, reducing it to about 172 acres. He said staff believed that Springfield might have a shortage of commercial land and surplus of industrial lands. Mr. Metzger emphasized the need to update the Buildable lands inventory and noted the recent Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Study, which indicated that more work was needed to determine what the inventory was. He said that demand was another factor, and the study did not address that issue. Mr. Metzger believed that the commission could trust intuitively that Springfield needed more commercial land.

Commissioner Beyer believed the study mentioned by Mr. Metzger lacked a qualitative aspect as it treated every square foot of land the same, and there was a difference. There were many smaller sites with an acute shortage of large sites. Choices were narrow.

Mr. Metzger emphasized the draft nature of the Jasper-Natron Specific Development Plan. He said the Jasper extension had a good chance of going through, and if it was constructed the City would need to examine and rearrange the development patterns in the vicinity. He noted the draft plan called for about 178 acres of new Campus Industrial land in that area.

Mr. Beyer asked about capacity in the sewer line, if the line would have to be moved, and if the design proposed functioned with it. Mr. Karp said the line would not have to be moved. The issue of capacity would be addressed at the master planning stage.

Mr. Beyer recalled issues related to sewer capacity in this area, and thought the City had done something to address that. However, he noted the added residential units being proposed and asked if the system was able to handle the additional load. Mr. Karp said yes.

Mr. Beyer determined from Mr. Karp that the ditch would remain an open ditch and would be relocated. Mr. Metzger said the ditch was manmade and the Army Corps of Engineers had no jurisdiction and the Division of State Lands had no objection to the relocation. Mr. Beyer asked if the ditch was a Soil and Water Conservation District facility. Mr. Karp said the ditch was part of the City's storm sewer system.

Commissioner Cole asked if the City was "playing favorites" given that he perceived the City. Mr. Karp suggested that depended on whether one thought the situation had changed over time. He pointed out the change in the use of Campus Industrial and the fact the development proposal covered the entire site as changes in circumstances.

Mr. Mott recalled that the commission had recommended to the council that it approve the Home Depot proposal, and the City Council decided against it. He said the commission needed to consider whether any of the uses being contemplated were unacceptable tradeoffs in comparison to the potential uses that could be located under the current plan designation and zone.

Mr. Karp explained that the area is a proposed Nodal Development Area, which calls for a mixed-use development. This proposal is the type of mixed-use development that would occur at this property.

Commissioner Cole asked if the proposed development was considered by staff to be nodal development or a partial nodal development. Mr. Mott responded that there is no standard blueprint for a Node. Staff understands why citizens may think that is the case. The guidance that the TPR provides is that a Node has certain elements to it. It might be on a major transportation line or corridor, there's transit service available, the development will allow bike/ped throughout the type of uses that are attracted to it, within the Node there is never more than ¼ mile distance between the transit facility and the activities, whether it be something special, commercial or office within the Node. Theoretically you could say the largest a Node can be is about 160 acres. Eugene has

designated one site that is significantly larger than 160 acres. Springfield has designated two sites that are much smaller.

Commissioner Cross asked if the proposal is more Nodal than just a standard development.

Mr. Mott responded that the plan designation there is 9 acres of commercial, 36 acres of medium density residential and 55 acres of campus industrial. There is no mixed-use zoning, no nodal overlay, so there is no reason to believe that under the current plan and zoning that anything approximating a Node would develop. There is the potential that a developer could provide bike and pedestrian connection through-out the campus industrial over to the residential. One of the points of having a Nodal designation and receiving direction from Council is to apply the Nodal designation on certain sites. So that we are guaranteed that certain attributes of a pedestrian oriented or transit oriented Nodal development will occur.

Commissioner Beyer, asked that the application in front of the Commission tonight is for the zone change, plan change. Mr. Karp responded that the handout of development renderings was submitted to show possible scenario. This is not what the development would look like, the Master Plan will make that determination.

Commissioner Kirschenmann asked Mr. Karp about the letter received from DLCD. He asked if 56 acres represent 29% of the existing CI, as of today. There is a paragraph in the letter which calculates it to about 194 acres designated CI right now. Mr. Karp responded that the Commissioners can look at the information in a couple of different ways. Gateway has 275 acres, some of that is in the City, some is in the UGB, and you have the 56 acres at the Pierce property, so there is probably more than what DLCD is stating in the letter. Mr. Karp went on to say that in relation to DLCD's comments, there is going to be a letter submitted into the record tonight, from Satre and Associates. Satre went through the DLCD letter and responded to all of their questions and concerns.

Commissioner Cross asked if there where anymore questions of staff. There was none.

2. ADJOURN

Commissioner Cross adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)