

### **ATTACHMENT 3 LIST OF POLICY ISSUES**

1. Use Lists. The Springfield Development Code (SDC) currently contains lengthy use lists in most zoning districts. If a particular use is not on the list, the SDC is interpreted as not allowing the use. This requires the applicant to either amend the SDC or request a Type II (staff Review with public notice) or Type III (PC review with public notice) use interpretation to determine if the use is similar to an existing use. Should staff pursue amending use lists to remedy this situation by using broad categories of uses with some examples in order to eliminate/lessen the need for the two processes listed above? Staff would add language in the revised use lists such as "...and similar uses." Staff would also amend the interpretation regulations in SDC Article 4 to allow a Type I (staff review with no public notice) interpretation process.
2. Should the vacation and annexation processes remain in the SDC or be placed in the Municipal Code? This issue was broached internally by staff last year during the SDC housekeeping amendments but was dropped because it was a policy issue.
  - a) Currently, the vacation regulations in SDC Article 9 refer to Springfield Municipal Code Sections 3.200 through 3.206 and ORS 271.080 et seq. The vacation regulations in the SMC refer to SDC Article 9. There are a number of jurisdictions that have vacation regulations in their municipal codes. Placing "vacations" in the Municipal Code would consolidate the process and eliminate cross references. Planning staff would still process vacation applications.
  - b) Currently, prior to annexation of land to the City the regulations in SDC Article 6 consist of the review of an annexation agreement and a referral from the City Council to the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission regarding support of the annexation request. After annexation, there is a process regarding withdrawal from special service districts. The annexation regulations appear only in the SDC and not in the SMC. Staff is also considering an annexation fee exemption for public agencies as in the case of park land for the Willamalane Parks and Recreation District.
3. Consider the elimination of SDC Section 31.010 Minimum Development Standards (MDS). This process was established in the 1990's as a way to meet a City Council Goal to "Beautify Springfield" when partially developed properties changed from one use to another. The intent was to bring the property up to minimum development standards by requiring the construction of sidewalks, paving and striping parking areas and installation of a landscape strip and street trees along the property's street frontage. Staff has had a difficult time becoming aware of a change in use because there is no general business license program in the City. Requiring these regulations to be met after there is a change in use is at times adversarial. Most Zoning/Development Codes do not have a process for this level of development. Last year 5 MDS applications were submitted with total fees of \$8,453.00. Does the City want to continue this process and are these applications worth the time and effort for the on-the-street results?
4. Continue the migration of Public Works standards from the SDC to the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual (design manual). This process began last year during the SDC housekeeping amendments project and only involved the

deletion of those standards that were outdated and/or duplicated. In the latter case, references to the design manual were added to the SDC. There are still standards, diagrams and tables in SDC Article 32 that should probably be placed in the design manual. In addition, staff needs to consider how much “up front” information is needed from the applicant especially concerning stormwater management. Resolution of this issue will have an impact on the submittal requirements and possibly the criteria of approval for Site Plan Review, Partition and Subdivision applications.

5. Consider deleting or substantially amending the residential solar regulations in SDC Article 16. Last year, during the housekeeping amendment process, staff raised the proposed deletion of the solar regulations contained in the Partition and Subdivision processes to a policy level. The City Council removed these solar regulations from the SDC because they were difficult to apply. Currently, under the remaining solar regulations, especially those in SDC Article 16, there are more and more conflicts between siting two story homes on in-fill lots and the solar setback standard. This situation has resulted from the tendency of developers to create minimum sized lots, especially those on north-south streets. For example, house with a height of 28 feet on a lot on a north-south street with 60 feet of frontage would require a 25-foot solar setback. Most houses a lot this size have minimal side setbacks (5-10 feet). This situation requires builders to either reorient the house to have the garage on the north side, use hip their roofs, and/or lower the pitch of their roofs to meet the solar setback standard. This is a problem which conflicts with the City’s goal of urban in-fill.