

City of Springfield
Work Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION HELD
Tuesday, November 20, 2007

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in Work Session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon on **Tuesday, November 20, 2007 at 6:00 p.m.**, with Frank Cross as Springfield Planning Commission Chair.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Chair Frank Cross, Vice Chair Bill Carpenter and Planning Commissioners Lee Beyer, Johnny Kirschenmann, Sheri Moore, Eric Smith and Terri Leezer. Also present were Planning Manager Greg Mott, Senior Planner Gary Karp, Senior Planner David Reesor, Planning Secretary Brenda Jones, and City Attorney Joe Leahy.

ABSENT

- None

APPLICATIONS

1. MARCOLA MEADOWS MASTER PLAN, SATRE ASSOCIATES – LRP2007-00028

The applicant proposed a phased, mixed-use development on 100.3 acres formerly known as the “Pierce” property, now called the “Villages at Marcola Meadows”. The site is located north of Marcola Road and west of 28th Street. The proposed development consists of a total of 518 homes on 54.7 gross acres, and a total of 449,600 square feet of retail/office use on 45.6 gross acres. There are 11.4 acres of proposed common open space including a constructed water feature, a park and open space required by multiple-family development. The submittal of this Master Plan, application was required by Condition #1 of Ordinance No. 6196.

Chair Commissioner Cross called the meeting of the Springfield Planning Commission to order and recognized Planner Gary Karp. Mr. Karp called attention to the cover memorandum accompanying the packet materials, which outlined the public process to be followed. He said there was no staff report addressing the criteria of approval and no commission decision was expected at the Public Hearing. He hoped to see a productive exchange of information.

Mr. Karp asked the commission to extend the time line for the staff report to December 11. Oral testimony would be concluded tonight and the written record would be held open for seven days (November 27, 2007), followed by a period of time to allow for a response from the applicant and staff (December 4). The commission would meet on December 11 to consider the application.

Commissioner Beyer clarified the details of the proposed input process with Planning Manager Greg Mott, and asked if citizens would get a chance to respond to the staff report. Mr. Mott said citizens

would receive an opportunity to comment on the record. Mr. Karp indicated the public's comments would be reflected in the staff report. Mr. Mott emphasized that citizens would not be denied the opportunity to comment.

Mr. Karp called attention to the underlying basic assumptions listed on page 4 of the staff report and suggested the commission might receive testimony that caused it to add to the list. He indicated he would ask the commission to make a recommendation related to the issue as part of a master plan approval; the only time they were mentioned in the code was in regard to the process to modify the master plan. Staff wanted to be on record stating what the underlying assumptions were.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Beyer about the nature of the master plan and the degree to which the applicant could make changes to the plan in the future, Mr. Karp characterized the master plan as being more detailed than a conceptual plan. He said it informed the public as to how the phases of development could occur.

Commissioner Beyer noted that the plan included the number of lots and units, street designs, commercial building designs, and conceptual drawings, and suggested that citizens unfamiliar with the process might perceive the master plan as inconsistent with the development on the ground. He believed there was a considerable degree of flexibility for the developer to achieve the plan. Mr. Karp agreed there was some degree of flexibility. For example, there could be more or less commercial or residential development, but the street and utility designs were fairly fixed. He said that was the reason he recommended the commission address the underlying assumptions. If, for example, the applicant wished to add more residential units than provided for in the traffic impact analysis (TIA), a master plan amendment would be required, and the level of plan amendment review (type I, II, or III) would help staff determine the impact on the underlying assumptions.

Commissioner Beyer thought the proposed process a positive one and emphasized his interest in ensuring that citizens had time after the staff report was completed to make comments. Mr. Karp said that citizens would have a chance to comment on December 11.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Karp said that a TIA was submitted as part of the application. Staff was in the process of reviewing that document, and that review would be incorporated into the December 11 staff report. Commissioner Carpenter asked if the staff report would address the relationship between mass transit and the development. Mr. Karp indicated a separate section of the staff report would address bus service to the site.

Responding to a request for comment by Chair Cross, Mr. Mott said that underlying what staff did was the perspective that the goal was to get to "yes" for applications for development, particularly if the application included permitted uses. It was not whether, but how, the process happened. He said the commission was not facing a development approval; that would occur in the subdivision process, which the master planning process was a prelude to. More review steps for the developer lay ahead. He said that staff would carefully note the public comments that were made, the applicant's responses, and would connect those comments and responses to the specific criteria of approval approved by the City Council when it adopted the plan amendment and those associated with the master planning process.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Moore about the length of time the master plan would apply, Mr. Karp said that the initial time frame was for seven years; additional extensions would require commission approval.

Chair Cross closed discussion on the item and briefly overviewed the public hearing process that would occur later.

2. **AMENDMENT TO THE SDC RE: ANNEXATION PROCESS CHANGE, CITY OF SPRINGFIELD - LRP2007-00026**

By enactment of the 2007 Legislature, the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission ceases to exist on July 1, 2008; annexation to cities becomes the jurisdiction of the affected city while annexation to districts, district creation, and district dissolution or district consolidation is the jurisdiction of Lane County. In acknowledge of the abruptness of this legislation and the limited opportunities to get on a Boundary Commission agenda, applications to annex to cities submitted after January 1, 2008 shall be processed solely by the cities.

Mr. Mott provided background on the item, reminding the commission of a bill passed in 2007 by the Oregon State Legislature abolishing the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission as of January 1, 2008. As a consequence, Springfield and other Lane County cities would need to have an ordinance in place by January 1, 2008, which laid out the City's policies and procedures for future annexations. Mr. Mott said the ordinance was largely based on Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 222, which regulated municipal annexations in Oregon. He said the process was on a fast track, and staff would ask the commission to make a recommendation following the public hearing as the City Council was scheduled to hold a public hearing on December 3, followed by adoption. If the City failed to have an ordinance in place by January 1, annexation applications would have to be processed under the State statute, which would be an awkward process.

Mr. Mott noted that he had found some omissions in the staff report after publication, which he attributed to the fast track the process was on. He said he would call attention to those omissions during the public hearing. Mr. Mott briefly reviewed the omissions.

Mr. Mott said the City Council had some latitude to include provisions in the ordinance that were drawn specifically from ORS 222 but could be based on the construction of that statute. For example, the State statute included provisions addressing how health hazards were addressed in regard to the extraterritorial extension of sewer and water services, but there was nothing in the statute to prevent the City from non-health hazard extraterritorial extensions of those services. He recommended that the option be forwarded to the City Council, which could eliminate it if it chose.

Mr. Mott recommended that all annexations be subject to a public hearing, with the exception of a developed single-family lot with no further development potential. The Development Services Director would make the decision in those cases.

Mr. Mott said another local option proposed for the ordinance but not included in ORS 222 was annexation agreements between the property owner and the City related to fiscal responsibility for services and service extensions and the timing of extensions. He recommended that be a requirement of all annexations, although he acknowledged it would serve no purpose for single-family lots. Responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Smith, Mr. Mott said that the agreement would answer questions such as who would pay to extend services to the annexing property and how engineering costs were shared.

Mr. Mott noted that Lane County and the City of Eugene were in the same position as Springfield in having to prepare ordinances that were to be effective January 1. He anticipated that the policies in

the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General Area Plan relative to the boundary commission would be deleted or amended at a later time.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Moore, Mr. Mott confirmed that the City could amend the ordinance at a later time if it was found to be unworkable.

3. DISCUSSION OF NEEDED RESIDENTIAL LANDS INVENTORY AND GOAL 14

This past September the Planning Commission received a letter from Commissioner Carpenter requesting that work session discussion items not be limited to “pre-hearing” staff presentations serving primarily as a prelude to that evening’s public hearings. Commissioner Carpenter suggested a series format of topics during each work session that would allow the Commission to become more engaged in the substance of the various land use and planning issues confronting the City of Springfield.

Mr. Mott reminded the commission that Commissioner Carpenter had identified several topics for commission discussion during a series of refocused work session where preparation for public hearings was minimized and more time was spent on planning issues. Those items were listed in the briefing materials provided to the commission. Mr. Mott called attention to a list of current division projects included in the briefing materials, and suggested there was overlap between the projects and the issues listed by Commissioner Carpenter.

Mr. Mott said that each of the items listed was a legitimate discussion item and some would require very long work sessions to process. From the division’s perspective, all that it was currently engaged in hinged on the implementation of House Bill (HB) 3337, which had created a significant impact on the division’s workload. He suggested that staff review Commissioner Carpenter’s topic list and prepare briefing memorandums, with the caveat that they could not all be prepared at one time. The commission could review the briefing memorandums and then decide if a further work session was warranted.

Mr. Mott noted the relationship between the Residential Lands Study and HB 3337 and suggested that might be an opportunity for staff to brief the commission on the amount and type of work required and could lead to further commission discussion focused on more planning rather than process.

Commissioner Leezer noted that the commission had three very new commissioners and welcomed any additional information. She expressed appreciation to Commissioner Carpenter for his letter.

Commissioner Beyer thought Mr. Mott’s recommendation was a step in the right direction. He suggested that the commission could first focus on Commissioner Carpenter’s first topic, “Metropolitan General Plan: How we got here and current issues.” He also thought it would benefit the commission to receive more background on the Residential Lands Study. He suggested that Commissioner Carpenter’s transportation-related issues be grouped for more effective discussion.

Mr. Mott endorsed Commissioner Beyer’s approach but said he would need to seek assistance from Transportation staff and would have to discuss its ability to respond with Transportation Manager Tom Boyatt before he could commit the division to the time it would take to bring these items to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mott provided the commission with copies of State Goal 14, Urbanization, and handouts from the Metro Plan showing the urban growth boundary around Eugene and Springfield. He said one of the cornerstones of Oregon's land use planning program was the protection of farm and forest lands and other non-urban resources of value to the State.

Commissioner Carpenter interjected at this point, suggesting that staff review the commission calendar and if there were items that lent themselves to commission education, to bring those forward to the commission. He referred to HB 2237 (??) and averred that there were different legal positions about whether the City could move its industrial and commercial urban growth boundaries because they were not addressed in the statute. He asserted it could be many years before HB 2237 was resolved through the court system. He questioned whether the City could begin to focus on land outside the UGB as he thought it premature based on what he believed were the legal issues related to the "other two urban growth boundaries" that had not been addressed.

Chair Cross suggested that was not Mr. Mott's intent. He said he and Mr. Mott were attempting to use the list developed by Commissioner Carpenter to help new commissioners understand what already existed in terms of urban planning. He and Mr. Mott had felt the discussion was a good place to start. He said the question was how to accomplish what was desired as 15 minutes was not a lot of time to cover a large topic and it did not do much good to have the discussion if the commission was unable to return to it for several months. He believed the commission needed to decide how it wished to receive the information. He was working with Mr. Grile and Mr. Mott to create a structure that worked for the commission.

Commissioner Moore suggested that the commission might wish to consider holding additional work sessions. She acknowledged the additional staff work load involved, but asserted that a Medford Planning Commissioner told her the Medford Planning Commission met weekly. Chair Cross said that the commission's meeting schedule was largely based on the hearings that occurred, but it could decide what it wished to do as a commission.

Chair Cross said it was possible that the commission could arrange to meet a third evening each month. He pointed out that staff needed to have time to put meeting information together and staff time could be limited at the end of the year with the press of business. However, the commission could consider adding taking advantage of meeting dates that did not include a public hearing. Commissioner Carpenter endorsed that idea. He maintained the commission should always plan on meeting two times a month and if there was nothing to decide, it should have at least two hour work sessions on the identified topics.

Chair Cross recommended the commission continue the discussion at the public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting was adjourned at 7 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Brenda Jones/Kimberly Young