

Decision Matrix for April 20th Joint Planning Commission Meeting

Issue 1

Co-adopt Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan Amendment: **Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan** (LRP 2009-00014/PA 09-6018)

- establishes a **separate Springfield urban growth boundary** to implement HB 2007 Or Laws Chapter 650 (HB 3337) and ORS 197.295 to 197.314
- creates a **new refinement plan of the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan** for land within the Eugene-Springfield Metro urban area east of Interstate Highway I-5;
- adopts related goals, objectives, findings, policies, designations, measures, analyses, determinations, and inventories to **demonstrates that Springfield's comprehensive plan provides a 20-year supply of land** pursuant to statewide planning goals and rules;
- updates the City's residential, commercial and industrial land inventories

Action Item
<p>Action Item 1: Residential Land and Housing Element</p> <p><i>Recommend/not recommend adoption of <u>Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan (SRP) Residential Land and Housing Element</u>, (incorporating Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis) with policies to address deficiencies.</i></p> <p>Reference: Section A – Residential Land and Housing Element</p>
Mandate/Rationale for Action
<p>Why this action is needed:</p> <p>House Bill 3337 requires that Springfield demonstrate as required by ORS 197.296 that its Comprehensive Plan provide sufficient buildable lands within an urban growth boundary to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years on or before January 1, 2010.</p> <p>The Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis (RLHNA) prepared for the City by ECONorthwest completes the residential land inventory, analysis, and housing needs determination required by HB 3337 to provide Springfield with an inventory and analysis of residential land needs for the plan period 2010-2030. The analysis indicates that 5,980 additional units will be needed to provide a 20-year supply of housing to meet Springfield's needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The Low Density Residential designation has a <i>surplus</i> of approximately 72 gross acres.▪ The Medium Density Residential designation has a <i>surplus</i> of approximately 18 gross acres.▪ The High Density Residential designation has a <i>deficit</i> of approximately 34 gross acres. <p>* NOTE The SRP must include policies to address this deficit.</p>

Decision Points

Q1. Do the proposed plan diagram and policies provide sufficient buildable lands within an urban growth boundary to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years? YES or NO

- Accommodate 5,980 new dwelling units to accommodate growth between 2010 and 2030?
- Low density residential?
- Medium density residential?
- High density residential?

Q2. Do the proposed policies address housing needs? YES or NO

- Address the identified shortage of HDR land through redesignation of land to establish transit-oriented high density residential neighborhoods in Glenwood and Downtown nodes through subsequent PAPAs.
- Provide sufficient land to accommodate an overall mix of approximately 60 percent new single family and approximately 40 percent multifamily dwellings.
- Provide development options that encourage and facilitate development of attached and clustered single-family housing types to accommodate an overall mix of approximately 53 percent new single family and approximately 47 percent multifamily dwellings.
- Designate land and update zoning ordinances to attain an average residential density of 7.9 dwelling units per net acre over the 2010 and 2030 plan period.
- Provide adequate buildable residential land through designation of new high density residential neighborhoods in the City's target redevelopment areas, and implementation of efficiency measures that increase the likelihood that residential development will occur at densities sufficient to accommodate the projected 20 year housing needs.
- Increase residential density in Nodal Mixed-Use Centers and along corridors served by frequent transit service.
- Identify and remove regulatory barriers to siting and constructing higher density housing types in existing MDR and HDR districts. Update building height allowances, and consider increasing density maximums in existing HDR and Nodal Development areas that served by frequent transit service. Apply the high density and MUR plan designation to support new housing development in or near Downtown and Glenwood nodes where the existing Urban Renewal District funding mechanism can help fund the infrastructure necessary to support redevelopment.

- Create new development opportunities and housing choices through establishment of a Residential Low Moderate (RLM) plan designation and zoning district with a density range of 8-14 du/acre to create opportunities for siting and constructing more a more diverse neighborhood housing type and mix. Consider applying zone to infill opportunity sites identified in neighborhood planning process. Allow rowhouses, duplexes and cottage clusters as outright permitted uses (no Discretionary Use approval required) and establish a Type I ministerial land use review process.
- Allow density averaging for split zone/designation parcels.
- Correlate parking requirements in mixed-use districts more directly to the City’s overall mixed-use development vision. Update parking requirements and develop parking management strategies (such as pay-in lieu programs) where appropriate to support economical higher density development and urban form.
- Link parking requirements more directly to transportation mode-split goals where transit systems provide frequent service.

Q3. Do the proposed Implementation Actions address housing needs? YES or NO

- Convert Metro Plan gross densities to net densities:
 LDR > RL 6-14 dwelling units per acre & RLM 8-14 dwelling units per acre
 MDR > RM 14-28 dwelling units per acre
 HDR > RH 28-42 dwelling units per acre; RH with TC Overlay 28-60 dwelling units per acre; RMU in Glenwood Riverfront & Downtown District >50 dwelling units per acre; Density Transfer Receiving Areas: Maximum TBD allowed building height.
 *Note: More restrictive standards apply in the Hillside Development Overlay District where larger lot sizes are required to compensate for slope constraints and engineering requirements.
- Establish building height limits in the RMU and Density Transfer Receiving Areas to implement the density ranges.
- Create a Residential Low-Moderate (RLM) plan designation that allows the creation of small lots (3,000 square feet minimum) to encourage development of more affordable single family dwelling housing types.
- Consider applying the Residential Low-Moderate (RLM) plan designation to existing LDR land in Jasper-Natron through Jasper-Natron Specific Area Plan adoption process.
- Consider applying the Low-Moderate Density plan designation to existing LDR land in Glenwood through the Glenwood Refinement Plan Update process.
- Designate land to accommodate a minimum of 213 dwelling units in the high density category in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District through redesignation of approximately 34.6 gross acres of land designated “Mixed Use/Nodal Development” to “Residential Mixed Use/Nodal”. This

action will result in a loss of 270 dwelling units in the medium density category that must be addressed in the inventory.

- Adjust the residential land inventory to address a loss of 270 dwelling units in the medium density category in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District.
- Adjust the assumptions (if necessary) of the commercial and industrial land inventory to address a loss of ____ gross acres in the commercial mixed use category and ____ gross acres in the light medium industrial category in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District (where land is redesignated for housing)
- Increase the minimum density of land in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan District to 50 dwelling units per acre on approximately 34.6 gross acres of land designated “Mixed Use/Nodal Development”. Establish a density gradient with corresponding building heights through the Glenwood Refinement Plan Update planning process.
- Consider implementation of a Density Bonus Program to provide an economic incentive for construction of high density development with structured parking in the Downtown and Glenwood Nodal Development areas. The program shall permit variance of the building height limits in specific “density receiving areas” identified in the Downtown and Glenwood District plans when a developer provides an extra community benefit such as dedication of public open space, construction of affordable housing units, etc. to be determined by the City Council.
- Establish a minimum density of 6 dwelling units per net acre in the Residential Low Density district.
- Increase the allowed density in the Residential High Density category to 60 dwelling units per acre for lands within ½ mile of existing and proposed EmX Transit stations.
- Create a Hillside Development Task Force to prepare and evaluate options for constructing more affordable housing types on sloped lands.
- Change plan designations to resolve existing residential plan-zone conflicts.
- Update design standards for residential development to provide equitable, clear and objective standards and development review procedures to reduce impediments to development of attached housing types, cluster development and multifamily housing. Consider application of a simplified and expedient Type I design/development review process (Ministerial decision) for review of residential land use permit applications.
- Increase opportunities for Mixed Use Nodal Development (ND):
 1. Consider expansion of the Glenwood node through the Glenwood Refinement Plan process.
 2. Consider expansion of the Downtown node through the Downtown District Plan process
 3. Consider future work program project: Downtown to Gateway EmX Corridor Plan to

- identify and evaluate nodal development opportunities along the new transit corridor
4. Consider future work program project: Main Street Corridor plan to identify and evaluate nodal development opportunities along the proposed transit corridor
 5. Apply TC Overlay District to existing high density housing areas within 1/2 mile of transit stations.
 6. Consider implementation of Jasper-Natron Specific Plan ND through Jasper-Natron Specific Area Plan adoption process.

- Consider establishing another Vertical Housing zone in the Glenwood Riverfront District.
- Establish a staff team and developer focus group to examine barriers that discourage the use of cluster development; prepare draft code amendments to remove/reduce regulatory impediments and identify incentives to encourage and reward cluster development; update Hillside Development Standards to support density transfers in the Hillside Overlay District; address street design standards that are identified as impediments.
- Establish an interdepartmental task team to prepare reduce street width standards to address efficient land use, potential cost savings, new ways to manage stormwater , climate issues, emergency access and traffic concerns.
- Identify and create opportunities for siting and constructing more diverse higher density neighborhood housing type and mix in MDR and HDR districts. Prepare neighborhood plans centered on schools and/or employment centers to update and/or replace existing refinement plans.
- Increase opportunities for siting residential and employment density in mixed-use nodal development centers and along corridors served by transit. Continue to target mixed-use nodal development centers and along corridors served by transit as focus of redevelopment incentives and focused planning efforts. Match areas of high infrastructure cost needs (e.g Glenwood, Main Street) with higher density development opportunity siting. Consider shadow platting for transitional urban centers with low land values (E.g. Franklin Blvd. and Main Street Corridor).

Action Item

Action Item 2: Economic Element

Recommend/not recommend adoption of Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan (SRP) Economic Element, (incorporating Commercial and Industrial Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis) with policies to address deficiencies.

The Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Economic Element articulates Springfield's economic development goals, objectives, and implementation actions to support Springfield's development/redevelopment strategy.

- Outlines Goals, Objectives and Implementation Actions to provide land for job growth 2010-2030
- Designates sufficient land to meet Springfield's commercial and industrial needs for the period 2010-2030.
- Identifies a need to expand the UGB (640 acres) to address a shortage of employment sites larger than 20 acres

Reference: [Section A – Economic Element](#)

Mandate/Rationale for Action

Why this action is needed:

OAR 660-009 requires cities to **maintain an inventory of land to provide for at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with local community development objectives.**

Pursuant to LCDC's Economic Development goal and rule in order to carry out mandate of 2007 Or Laws Chapter 650 requiring Springfield to separately establish its own urban growth boundary pursuant to statewide land use goals, the City of Springfield chose to conduct a commercial and industrial land study concurrently with the residential land study. The City of Springfield commissioned ECONorthwest to prepare a (1) a buildable lands inventory; (2) an economic opportunities analysis; and (3) an economic development strategy. All of these elements are required to comply with statewide planning Goal 9 and the Goal 9 rule (OAR 660-009).

Previous land studies were conducted jointly with Springfield's Metro Plan partners. Adoption of Springfield-specific economic development policies and implementation actions – through adoption of the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan – will allow the City to clearly articulate its desired economic future and its preferred land use strategies to attain that vision. Adoption of the study will establish a clear economic development direction that identifies the city's strengths and opportunities, and its position in the broader Southern Willamette Valley region. Adoption of the study will facilitate employment opportunities and job creation in Springfield by identifying industrial/employment land needs and developing an economic development strategy aimed at selected target industries.

The *Springfield Commercial and Industrial Buildable Lands Inventory, Economic Opportunities Analysis* (CIBL) provides 1) an employment forecast for Springfield; 2) identification of target industries; 3) a

comparison of land capacity and demand; and 4) characteristics of needed sites to determine the sufficiency of sites available for economic land uses. The key conclusions in the analysis of land availability and capacity for employment uses in Springfield are:

- The City assumes that 52% of new employment growth in Springfield will not require vacant land.
- Springfield will need employment land with sites characteristics that cannot be found within the existing UGB.
- The available supply of commercial and industrial buildable land in Springfield and the metro urban area east of I-5 does not fully meet Springfield's projected 20-year commercial and industrial land needs under current plan designations and policies.
- Springfield will need to add land to its Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate forecast employment growth and provide larger sites for target industry employers if the City is to meet local community development objectives.

The *Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies* updates and builds from previous economic development planning work by the City and provides the foundation for updated land use policies to implement the City's economic development vision. Applicable criteria include 2007 Or Laws Chapter 650, State Economic Development Planning Goals and Rules OAR 660-0015, OAR 660-009-0020, OAR 660-009-0025 as amended by LCDC in 2007, and applicable comprehensive plan policies.

Decision Points

Q4. Do the proposed economic objectives and strategies affirm Statewide Planning Goal 9 and the Metro Plan Goal with an appropriate emphasis on maintaining and enhancing Springfield's role, responsibility, and identity within the regional and state economies of which it is a part? YES or NO

- Provide an adequate supply of sites of varying locations, configurations, and size, to accommodate industrial and other employment over the planning period, as identified in the Springfield Economic Opportunities Analysis.
- Provide an adequate competitive short-term supply of suitable land to respond to economic development opportunities as they arise.
- Reserve sites over 20-acres for special developments and industries that require large sites.
- Provide adequate infrastructure efficiently and fairly.
- Encourage employers to locate in downtown Springfield, when appropriate.
- Encourage redevelopment of Glenwood with a mixed use employment and housing center.
- Redevelop brownfields as the opportunities for reuse arise. Springfield has more than 20

brownfield sites that will require clean-up before the sites can be redeveloped. Springfield has about 20 to 50 more sites that may be brownfields if the sites were available for redevelopment. The cost of clean-up will vary, depending on the prior uses and type of contamination on the site.

- Encourage development of commercial businesses in close proximity with residential uses, where appropriate.
- Support and assist existing businesses in Springfield.
- Increase the potential for employment in one of the regional industry clusters. The clusters include: Health Care, Communication Equipment, Information Technology (Software), Metals (Wholesalers), Processed Food and Beverage, Wood & Forest Products, and Transportation Equipment.
- Increase the potential for convention- and tourist-related economic activities to generate economic activity, especially in the service industries like retail, food services, and accommodations.
- Attract sustainable businesses and support sustainable development practices.

Q5. Do Springfield's Economic Opportunities Analysis and local community development objectives and strategies identify an unmet need for employment land with sites characteristics that cannot be found within the existing UGB? YES or NO

Q6. Are the conclusions of the CIBL Study supportable? YES or NO

Q8. Is the proposal to expand the UGB by 640 acres adequate to address a shortage of employment sites larger than 20 acres? YES or NO

Q9. If conclusions of the CIBL Study are not supportable, which assumptions should be reassessed?

Employment forecast during the plan period? Identification of target industries? Characteristics of needed sites? Comparison of land capacity and demand? Percentage of employment growth to be met by redevelopment? Percentage of employment growth not requiring commercial or industrial zoning? Prohibitive constraints? Other?

Q10. Does the proposed action (640 acres UGB expansion for employment land and plan policies establish an inventory of land within an urban growth boundary to provide for at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with Springfield’s local community development objectives? YES or NO

Action Item

Action 3: Urbanization Element & Springfield Urban Growth Boundary

Recommend/not recommend adoption of Urbanization Element with policies to address deficiencies and Springfield’s Urban Growth Boundary.

- Establish separate baseline Springfield UGB split by Interstate 5 with UGB as shown in 2030 Plan Diagram
- Add 640 acres to UGB to respond to provide land for employment pursuant to CIBL
- Select preferred alternative for UGB expansion

Reference: Section A – Urbanization Element & Section F UGB Alternatives Analysis

Mandate/Rationale for Action

House Bill 3337 requires that Springfield demonstrate as required by ORS 197.296 that its Comprehensive Plan provide sufficient buildable lands within an urban growth boundary to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years. A city’s UGB must also maintain an inventory of land to provide for at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with local community development objectives.

Decision Points

Q11. Does the SRP include policies that demonstrate Springfield’s use of existing and supplemental efficiency measures help meet needs for housing and other urban needs efficiently? YES or NO

Q12. Are SRP policies that demonstrate Springfield’s emphasis on focused district specific plans (e.g. Downtown and Glenwood plans) to facilitate efficiency of land use and urbanization through redevelopment supportable? YES or NO

Q13. Should “newly urbanizable” lands be added to Springfield’s UGB? YES or NO

Q14. Have the proposed “newly urbanizable” lands shown in the three UGB Concepts been selected in accordance with ORS 197.298, LCDC Goal 14, and LCDC’s Urban Growth Boundary Rule, OAR Chapter 660, Division 24? YES or NO

Q15 Does the preferred UGB concept add “newly urbanizable” areas to the Urban Growth Boundary of sufficient size and location to provide land that meets specific employment site needs identified in the Springfield Economic Opportunities Analysis consistent with the Springfield Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies? YES or NO

Q16 Does the preferred UGB concept add “newly urbanizable” areas to the Urban Growth Boundary of sufficient size and scale to be integrated efficiently into the urban area as complete neighborhoods or other community elements rather than as isolated individual parcels? YES or NO

Q17. Does/should the preferred UGB concept provide an adequate supply of sites of varying locations, configurations, and size, to accommodate industrial and other employment uses over the planning period? YES or NO

Q18. Does/should the preferred UGB concept provide an adequate supply of land to allow for choice of sites and to allow for sufficient market competition between sites? YES or NO

Q17. Select preferred concept for a 640 acre UGB expansion

Concept 1 Concept 2 Concept 3 Other

Q18. Is the City’s proposal to designate “newly urbanizable” areas added to the UGB as Urban Holding Areas that require a plan amendment (PAPA) process required to remove UHA and allow designation for urban development supportable? The Springfield Refinement Plan diagram assigns the Urban Holding Area designation to the newly urbanizable lands as an interim plan designation that does not allow development that would generate more vehicle trips than development allowed by the zoning assigned prior to inclusion in the boundary.

YES or NO

Q19. Shall all master plans for urban development on “newly urbanizable” lands require that development of such lands is consistent with the Urban Holding Area designations for such lands and with the site needs criteria for their inclusion in the UGB as expressed in the applicable Economic Opportunities Analysis, Residential Lands Analysis, UGB Alternatives Analysis, and related findings adopted in support of their inclusion? YES or NO

Q20. Is the City’s proposal to preserve large “newly urbanizable” sites supportable? The proposal would place limits on land division on employment land parcels 20 acres and larger sufficient to ensure that large parcels of land are available for businesses that need large parcels. The City proposes to preserve sites over 20-acres in areas identified as

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY - URBAN HOLDING AREA (E- UHA) for special developments and industries that require large sites. Large sites, especially sites with access to I-5 shall be designated to increase the potential for employment in one of the regional industry clusters such as but not limited to: Health Care, Communication Equipment, Information Technology (Software), Metals (Wholesalers), Processed Food and Beverage, Wood & Forest Products, and Transportation Equipment or development of industrial/technology/business parks to provide opportunities for development of business clusters of related or complementary businesses and industries identified in Springfield’s Economic Development Objectives and Implementation Strategies. The City proposes to work with property owners and their representatives to ensure that prime development and redevelopment sites throughout the City and Urban Growth Boundary that are designated for employment use are preserved for future employment needs and are not subdivided or used for non-employment uses. YES or NO

Action Item

Action 4: Land Use & Urban Design Element.

Recommend/not recommend adoption of Land Use & Urban Design Element

- Includes an accurate, up-to-date plan map of Springfield land use designations and a detailed description of plan designations to guide future changes in land use over the plan period
- Parcel specific Plan Diagram

Reference: Section A – Land Use & Urban Design Element

Mandate/Rationale for Action

House Bill 3337 requires that Springfield demonstrate as required by ORS 197.296 that its Comprehensive Plan provide sufficient buildable lands within an urban growth boundary to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years. A city’s UGB must also maintain an inventory of land to provide for at least a 20-year supply of commercial and industrial sites consistent with local community development objectives.

Decision Points

- Q21. Establish parcel-specific diagram? YES or NO**
- Q22. Prepare findings to support and incorporate redesignations to resolve plan-zone conflicts where feasible? YES or NO**

Proposed changes to SRP text to be included in the next draft to address DLCD comments.

1. SRP Introduction page 8. Staff recommends deleting the first sentence of the last paragraph so that the 2030 Refinement Plan is not described as the “guiding policy document for all land use decisions within Springfield’s urban growth boundary.” We will also recommend that the first sentence in the second paragraph on Page 9, which currently reads “The Springfield 2030 Plan replaces the Metro Plan as Springfield’s primary land use plan for the plan period ending in 2030.” be rewritten to describe our belief that there will be a greater *reliance* on the 2030 Refinement Plan than on the Metro Plan on a daily basis because the level of specificity provided in the 2030 Refinement Plan is far more likely to be relevant to the typical issues raised, if the past 20 years is any indication.
2. General comment. The final document will be formatted to distinguish policies from implementation actions.
3. Urbanization Element, Pages 10-12. Although Implementation Actions 41-50 speak to limiting division of land to preserve these sites for their intended use, land division does not limit use. If we propose to maintain existing County zoning on these sites, then presumably we intend to allow use consistent with those zones; if that approach does not protect these sites for intended future urban use, then the UHA must also include a prohibition on these uses. We also agree that the Springfield Development Code, Chapter 3 Land Use Districts, and Chapter 5 Development Review Process and Applications should be amended to incorporate the relevant components of these SRP Urbanization Element Implementation Actions.
4. Urbanization Element, # 28 is incomplete. In the last sentence it states: “*Add Goal 10 definition of constraints.*” The city also needs to also add the definition of “buildable land” in OAR 660-008-0005(2) before adoption.
5. Urbanization Element, # 29 Table: “Assumed Constraints – Residential Land.” The City adopted ordinances in 2003 establishing inventoried wetlands and code amendments to protect those wetlands as part of our Goal 5 compliance. The City adopted ordinances in 2004 protecting riparian resource areas adjacent to Class A streams (waterways capable of providing anadromous fish habitat). We will clarify that this refers to wetlands and riparian areas on our inventory or otherwise qualifying based on our acknowledged Goal 5 compliance. We will evaluate the impact of this situation; we believe that vestigial parcels created by right-of-way dedications, lot line adjustments and other activities have created “lots” that may technically be entitled to develop, but realistically have very marginal futures as legitimate buildable inventory.

6. Urbanization Element, # 30, the 2010 UGB Expansion Areas table is incomplete, missing data. We won't know what information to include in the UGB Expansion Areas table until the elected officials have made this decision some time later this year or next. We included this formatting as a place-holder. We will make the appropriate changes to this table as an element of adoption of the Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan.

7. Urbanization Element, #38. We will propose to add the following text: "In addition, the following sections of Goal 14 and OAR 660-0024-0060 are applicable to the evaluation and determination of needed land:

(2) Demonstrated need for housing, employment opportunities, livability or uses such as public facilities, streets and roads, schools, parks or open space, or any combination of the need categories in this subsection (2). In determining need, local government may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need. (Land Need, Goal 14)

2. The size of the parcels of urbanizable land that are converted to urban land should be of adequate dimension so as to maximize the utility of the land resource and enable the logical and efficient extension of services to such parcels. (Guidelines, A. Planning, Goal 14); and,

(5) If a local government has specified characteristics such as parcel size, topography, or proximity that are necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need, the local government may limit its consideration to land that has the specified characteristics when it conducts the boundary location alternatives analysis and applies ORS 197.298."

8. We previously responded to the question about protecting UHA land from inappropriate development; this applies to sites 20-acres in areas identified as E-UHA: We agree with that part of this comment regarding "sufficient protection from development that does not match the land needs identified in the EOA and HNA." Although Implementation Actions 41-50 (SRP Urbanization Element, Pages 10-12) speak to limiting division of land to preserve these sites for their intended use, land division does not limit use. If we propose to maintain existing County zoning on these sites, then presumably we intend to allow use consistent with those zones; if that approach does not protect these sites for intended future urban use, then the UHA must also include a prohibition on these uses. We also agree that the Springfield Development Code, Chapter 3 Land Use Districts, and Chapter 5 Development Review Process and Applications should be amended to incorporate the relevant components of these SRP Urbanization Element Implementation Actions.

9. Urbanization Element, # 38: Valid site need characteristics from employment land are controlled by Goal 14 and division 24, not just division 9. The city needs to add the relevant text in the "Land Need" section of Goal 14, and the text of OAR 660-024-0060(5).

10. Urbanization Element, #42 and #43. This policy needs to be supported with an

implementation action that will protect these sites for this purpose.

11. Urbanization Element, # 45, this policy needs to explain what is meant by the statement, *“designated and zoned predominantly for needed employment uses.”*
12. Urbanization Element, #46 Amend Springfield Development Code to exclude “big box retail or other regional commercial uses” in the E-UHA.
13. Urbanization Element, #47 The provision allowing the balance of land to be zoned for residential is not consistent with the need identified in the EOA and will be recommended for deletion. Unless substantial evidence is included in the record of the public hearing process on the SRP to justify a UGB expansion for residential purposes, these implementation measures should be deleted.
14. Urbanization Element # 48 – 50 address policies related to locations designated Residential Urban Holding Areas (R-UHA). Based on the Residential Lands and Housing Needs Analysis that supports the establishment of the Springfield UGB, and lacking the 2030 Land Use Diagram, we assume that no R-UHA areas have been or will be designated. The provision allowing the balance of land to be zoned for residential is not consistent with the need identified in the EOA and will be recommended for deletion. Unless substantial evidence is included in the record of the public hearing process on the SRP to justify a UGB expansion for residential purposes, these implementation measures should be deleted.
15. Urbanization Element Special Master Plan Requirements for Urban Holding Areas. The SRP and the Development Code need to include provisions and standards that prevent inappropriate development of any holding areas. We will propose language that will accomplish this requirement should the elected officials decide to include land into Springfield’s UGB.
16. Urbanization Element Findings. Amend Finding #8 to read *“Springfield’s Urban Growth Boundary has been established based on consideration of the following:*
 - 1) *Statewide Goal 14*
 - a. *The text of the current 2 land need criteria and*
 - b. *The text of the current 4 boundary location factors.*
 - 2) *The ORS 197.298 priorities to add land to a UGB; and*
 - 3) *The OAR 660, division 024 urban growth boundary rules.”*
17. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Overview. The second sentence in the first paragraph should be revised as follows: *“The Springfield 2030 Plan Diagram is a parcel-specific plan designation map that refines the general plan land use designations within the urban growth boundary shown in the Metro Plan Diagram.”* In the event the elected officials take an action that results in a change to the UGB that goes beyond the

existing Plan Boundary, language will be recommended for inclusion in this chapter.

18. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Springfield Plan Designations.

a) Lands within current UGB:

19. This section makes reference to conforming the 2030 Plan Diagram to all adopted Metro Plan and refinement plan land use designations, with exceptions. The 2030 Plan needs to document these exceptions and explain how they affect the land needs identified in the EOA and Residential Land and Housing Needs Analysis. In the next draft staff will identify exceptions whether through footnote or text elsewhere, and an accompanying explanation of the relationship of these sites and the two land use evaluations.

20. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Springfield Plan Designations. b) Newly

urbanizable lands: first sentence. The first sentence was changed subsequent to the submittal to read: *"...and may require addition of land to Springfield's UGB..."* instead of *"...and will therefore some additional land."*

21. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Springfield Plan Designations. Table LU-2

Preliminary Springfield 2030 Refinement Plan Land Use Map Designations.

The RLM and SLR are interchangeable; we will recommend that one be selected.

We agree that descriptions and implementation measures need to be added for "Transit Corridor" Employment Center Opportunity" and "R-UHA" this latter only if needed to reflect a decision by the elected officials.

22. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Policies and Implementation Actions #4.

The RLM has replaced the SLR as a proposed additional zoning district that implements the Low Density Residential Plan diagram designation. Since this is a new development model there are some question about universal appropriateness; we believe the hearing process will make a better determination of applicability than staff-level discussion.

The district can't go forward without concurrent amendment to the Springfield Development Code. Upon a final decision by the elected officials the specifics of this zoning district, if adopted, can be developed and included in the Development Code.

23. Land Use and Urban Design Element. Policies and Implementation Actions #9.

needs to be rewritten to clarify how density averaging works. This proposal does not include any statements about the SLR or duplex development.

24. Economic Development Element. Goals.

The elected officials have not adopted this Economic Framework Plan into the Metro Plan. The City is proposing to incorporate some of these strategies into the SRP to help implement this initiative of the joint

elected officials. We believe these strategies are consistent with existing Metro Plan policies and with our EOA; these strategies certainly are endorsed by all of the governing bodies that have jurisdiction of the Metro Plan. The EOA was completed months before the JEO Economic Framework Plan therefore the latter is not reflected by the former. We will prepare findings that establish consistency between these documents as well as the Metro Plan.

25. Economic Development Element. Implementation Action 4.1. *re Designate and zone land to provide sites that meet the site characteristics and site sizes described in the Economic Opportunity Analysis.* The suggestions made by the Department are more appropriate to a broader perspective of all land needs for commercial and industrial development. However, the intended beneficiary of Action 4.1 could benefit further by amendment to the Code regarding use and development standards. We will recommend that such language be included in this Action. The City will identify where these large sites are and how they will be protected and reserved for their intended use.
26. Economic Development Element. Implementation Action 4.15. “As appropriate” as it appears in Action 4.15 should be revised to say “as appropriate and as permitted by the Springfield Development Code.”
27. Economic Development Element. Implementation Action 5.1. Rather than define the meaning of “relatively easily and at a comparatively low cost” Action 5.1 should be rewritten to identify priority based on capital improvement programming and availability of funding such as SDCs or urban renewal funding.
28. Economic Development Element. EO-10. The bullets under EO-10 should be deleted; they are findings, not implementation actions. We also agree that “grayfield” sites should be included in this Objective.
29. Economic Development Element. We agree that nodal development should play a larger role in economic development. We will recommend such language be included in this section.

Issue 2

Adopt amendments to the Springfield Development Code to implement Land Use Efficiency Measures – Phase One
(LRP 2009-00015/PA 09-6018)

- Creates a Small Lot Residential District
- Establishes a minimum density of 6 dwelling units per net acre in the LDR District
- Requirement a mix of housing types in SLR developments

Action Item

Action Item 1: Adopt Springfield Development Code Amendments

Recommend/not recommend adoption of Springfield Development Code Amendments: Land Use Efficiency Measures Phase One Implementation

Reference: [Section](#)

Mandate/Rationale for Action

Why this action is needed:

House Bill 3337 requires that Springfield demonstrate as required by ORS 197.296 that its Comprehensive Plan **provide sufficient buildable lands within an urban growth boundary to accommodate estimated housing needs for 20 years** on or before January 1, 2010.

The Springfield City Council and Planning Commission have directed staff to prepare policies and implementation tools to meet Springfield’s future land use needs. The Residential Lands Stakeholder Committee and Planning Commission reviewed and prioritized potential Land Use Efficiency Measures for Springfield and recommended that the City Council consider implementing these measures or consider changing existing policies to increase the land-use efficiency derived from these measures.

Two public open houses were conducted in April-May 2009 to gather input on the proposed measures. In April 2009, the City Council directed staff to work with the Planning Commission to develop the planning tools necessary to implement Phase One measures. The proposed code amendments implement existing Metro Plan policies and are further supported by proposed SRP policies and plan designations.

Section Proposed to be Amended

Reason for Amendment

3.2-100

Adds Small Lot Residential District (SLR) to the base zoning district list

3.2-205

Establishes a minimum density of 6 dwelling units per net acre in the LDR District
Adds the SLR District description
Amends other residential district descriptions

3.2-210	Adds uses for the SLR District
3.2-215	Adds base zone development standards for the SLR District
3.3-825	References SDC residential densities for Future Development Plans in the UF-10 Overlay District (see also 5-12-120/130)
4.7-140	Adds Type I design standards for duplexes on corner lots/parcels and for certain duplex development in the MDR/HDR Districts
4.7-233	Adds a new Section with requirement for a mix of housing types in SLR developments
5.4-100	Adds a Type I process to Table 5.4-1, Development Applications, for duplex design standards
5.12-120	References SDC residential densities for Future Development Plans in the land division process (see also 3.3-825)
5.12-130	Adds a condition of approval for recording a Future Development Plans with the Plat (see also 3.3-825)
6.1-110	Adds/revises definitions pertaining to “dwellings” in support of the SLR District

Decision Points

Q1. Are the proposed code amendments supportable? YES or NO