

To:	Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions
From:	Gregory Mott, Planning Manager
Date:	May 4, 2010
Subject:	Planning Commission Action on Proposed Parcel-Specific Refinement Plan Diagram

Issue

A component of the City's proposed 2030 Refinement Plan package includes the adoption of a parcel-specific plan diagram (in preference to a general "blob" diagram) for all land within the City's new urban growth boundary (UGB).¹ The advantages of this product include an accurate and timely data base (buildable lands inventory) and the certainty that comes with knowing the correct plan designation and zoning on any parcel within the UGB.

The City's proposal involves 297 parcels totaling 187 acres; 66.24 acres of this total are vacant. All of these proposals are redesignations, not zone changes. The new plan designations will match the existing zoning of *vacant* land or the existing zoning and land use of *developed* land. In each instance these properties are located at the interface between the existing designation and the proposed redesignation therefore the plan diagram will not see a "new" designation heretofore not present at the general location of the proposal.

In addition to the city-initiated changes, the planning commissions received testimony in the form of requests from a number of property owners to redesignate or rezone their property. Both the city-initiated and the property owner-initiated requests are identified by tax lot in this memorandum. The planning commissions will be asked to consider these changes and forward a recommendation (support, oppose, incorporate with another study) on to their respective elected officials.

Background

When HB3337 was enacted by the legislature in 2007, the City of Springfield began a residential lands determination required by this law. Part of that determination required an accurate inventory data base, something we acknowledged we didn't have because of the presence of a "general" plan diagram and an unknown number of plan/zone conflicts. As we drilled deeper into this issue using our GIS data base it became apparent that the majority of these conflicts were parcel fragments that revealed discrepancies that occur when comparing a generalized Plan diagram and a parcel specific zoning map. In effect, the conflicts were registration errors between the two types of mapping. The intended land use designation shown by the Metro Plan Diagram was evident, but the Diagram did not register exactly with the underlying parcels and the zoning for those parcels. Refinement Plan/zoning conflicts were clearly identifiable as differences between the assigned designation and the zoning for the same parcel.

Where registration errors were evident, and the affected parcel fragments were less than 1,000 square feet in size, fragments were assumed to be consistent with the parent parcel and not a plan/zone conflict; these

¹ Development of the 2030 Plan revealed approximately 895 instances where the zoning of a parcel is not consistent with the Metro Plan and/or refinement plan designation. Staff proposes Metro Plan/Refinement Plan changes to resolve 297 of them; resolving all 895 conflicts cannot occur at this time because ongoing planning efforts (Downtown and Glenwood) may result in entirely new plan designations, and the Main Street corridor, which contains many of these conflicts, is proposed as a specific area study that is proposed to commence at the conclusion of the 2030 Refinement Plan process.

parcels were consolidated, without being listed as an amendment action, into the parent plan designation that appears on the proposed 2030 Refinement Plan diagram.

There were numerous parcel fragments larger than 1,000 square feet (but less than the minimum lot size) that also left little doubt about the intended Metro Plan Designation of the parent lot; however, these cases were treated as plan/zone conflicts. The majority of the 895 plan/zone conflicts are composed of these larger fragments for which the intent of the Metro Plan Diagram requires little interpretation. These parcels, and those few that are sufficiently large enough to preclude a cursory examination are included in the list of parcels proposed for change (**See Exhibit A**). That list identifies each parcel by assessor's map and tax lot numbers; by current Metro Plan and Refinement Plan designation (where applicable); by size; by recommended plan designation; and include a notation of the reason for the change. This information is further defined by font style and color: green font is within ¼ mile of Main Street or Franklin Boulevard; aqua font is within ½ mile of highway interchanges; black font is outside of these two distance factors; and italicized font of any color is vacant land. We've made these notations about distance from state highway facilities and vacant land because a plan amendment or zone change may trigger a Transportation Planning Rule analysis (OAR 660 Division 12).

During the course of the public hearing a number of property owners submitted written and oral testimony requesting a Metro Plan, or refinement plan amendment to change the designation of their property. Each of those requests are included in **Exhibit B** to this memorandum. We've included a statement in bold font identifying adjacent or nearby property designation.

Discussion

Staff believes a parcel-specific plan diagram is an improvement over the existing general plan diagram because it provides a reliable graphic tool for citizens; because it accurately represents each land use category; because it clearly identifies where land uses of all types are proposed to develop/redevelop; because property owners have assurance that neighboring properties will develop with a specific category of use (or will be prohibited from developing certain uses); because it identifies the sites for future neighborhood and community improvements such as schools, parks and open space; and because proposals to amend the plan are not blurred by the unintended ambivalence created by a generalized plan diagram.

The proposal to create a parcel-specific plan diagram requires an affirmative action by the elected officials. The planning commission deliberation on this proposal should include whether or not the community is better served by such a plan diagram; the disposition of the 297 parcels identified for action by staff; and the disposition of the 20 parcels subject to property owner requests. The planning commissions are not limited to a macro discussion; any of these properties and proposed actions can be the subject of deliberation and recommendation to the elected officials. The planning commission recommendation need not be approval or opposition to these individual actions; the planning commissions can forward a recommendation that the elected officials *consider* the changes proposed for these individual parcels as part of their consideration of a parcel-specific plan diagram.

Additional Implications and Information on a Parcel-Specific Plan Diagram

The parcel-specific plan diagram is an accurate depiction of the true location of each land use category, and the urban growth boundary, as that data is digitized in our GIS system. A new, parcel-specific urban growth boundary for Springfield does not change any current land use designations nor does it change the existing urban growth boundary (if no expansion to the UGB is adopted by the elected officials) because the UGB will remain exactly where it is with the exception of a new line down the center of I-5 right-of-way. It also enables the city to comply with the requirement of LCDC's new UGB rules. OAR 660-024-0020 requires that "The UGB and amendments to the UGB must be shown on the city and county plan and zone maps at a scale sufficient to determine which particular lots or parcels are included in the UGB. Where a UGB does not follow lot or parcel lines, the map must provide sufficient information to determine the precise UGB location." This action applies to all land within the City's UGB and establishment of the City's new UGB. Adoption of this action requires participation by the City and County as decision-makers.

Recommendation

Forward recommendation to the elected officials to consider each of these changes during the discussion/deliberation of a parcel-specific 2030 Refinement Plan diagram.