

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, June 19, 2006 at 6:27 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Lundberg, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, Administrative Assistant Julie Wilson and members of the staff.

Councilor Fitch was absent (excused).

1. Staff Initiated Interpretation of Cluster Subdivision Standards within the Hillside Development Overlay District of the City of Springfield.

City Planner Jim Donovan presented the staff report on this item. City Council will hear a Staff initiated request for Interpretation during its regular session on July 17, 2006. The attached Planning Commission Staff Report and Request for Recommendation will be discussed with City Council on June 19, 2006 to familiarize Council with the issues.

This interpretation is initiated by staff to confirm that the Hillside Development Overlay District (Article 26 of the Springfield Development Code) permits Cluster Subdivisions as per the past practice of allowing Cluster Subdivisions on property within the Hillside Development District in compliance with the provisions of the overlay district. Planning Commission and City Council endorsement of staff's interpretation will provide a measure of security for the development community and resolve any interpretation questions which may arise during future development review or appeals.

The Planning Commission on June 20 will conduct a public hearing and consider the proposed interpretation. After the hearing, the Planning Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for final determination in accordance with Section 4.050 of the Springfield Development Code.

Mayor Leiken said there had been a lot of this going on in other communities. Bend had been doing something similar over the last few years. He said he would be curious to hear the comments from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Donovan said it was a logical use and there was precedence as it had been used in the master plan for Mountaingate.

2. Progress Report and Discussion of Development Code Reformatting Project.

Planning Manager Greg Mott presented the staff report on this item. In May of 2005 the Council endorsed a recommendation from the Planning Commission to reformat the SDC to make this document easier to read and use. A staff technical advisory committee began working on the project in December 2005 and expects to be completed by Spring 2007. The new format will reorganize the existing 44 Articles into 6 chapters using a more flexible alpha-numeric reference system.

The current phase of the code reformat project began in December, 2005 with the formation of a staff technical advisory committee (TAC) to provide advice and guidance to the preparation of a reformatted SDC. The TAC has met three times this spring and has recommended the following actions: 1. convert the existing organization of the SDC from 44 separate articles into 6 chapters that combine like subjects, e.g., all zoning districts in a single chapter, all development standards in a single chapter; 2. a new format for each chapter that places information in proper sequence with an alpha-numeric reference that is easy to cite, easy to locate and easy to expand for future amendments; and 3. highlight all reformatting proposals that stray from a strictly editing exercise into potential policy decisions. Attachment 3 was prepared as a prototype for Planning Commission and City Council review. If Council endorses this format and organization, the remaining five chapters will be prepared over the summer months.

At their June 6, 2006 work session, the Planning Commission reviewed the attachments listed above and concluded that meeting by: 1. endorsing the proposed reorganization into 6 chapters; 2. endorsing the alpha-numeric format; and 3. recommending that this project keep to reformatting as much as possible, but compile all policy issue changes for Council consideration as a future Development Code project.

Mr. Mott referred to Attachments 2 (Proposed SDC Organizational Framework) and 3 (Prototype of what the reformatted code would look like) included in the agenda packet. He described some of the reformatting to combine sections that had duplication. The technical staff from Public Works (PW) and Development Services Department (DSD) were working on this to stay clear of Ballot Measure 37 issues and policy issues. He referred to Attachment 4, which did include some policy issues. The Planning Commission had recommended staff finish the reformatting and make note of the questions regarding policy for a separate assignment. Attachment 4 had the questions about policy that came up during reformatting. Staff tried to make the document more user friendly and less cumbersome. The Planning Commission thought the policy issue discussion could drag out the process. Staff wanted to make sure Council approved of how the chapters had been defined. The style was not like current code.

Planner Gary Karp had been foreman of the project in the office. Mr. Karp said Mr. Mott had explained the reformatting sufficiently.

Councilor Lundberg said she liked the format and felt it was easier to follow. She said she didn't know about the numbering system, but assumed 3 referred to Chapter 3, etc. She said she was not entirely clear the Planning Commission wanted the policy part separate, and noted the process for bringing back certain policy issues that were more difficult to sort out.

Mr. Karp said they had only listed five policy items out of about twenty-five issues. He explained.

Councilor Ralston said anything that made it simpler was good. He asked if we could get to the Development Code online and asked if this would also be online. Yes. He asked if links could be set up for referenced numbers.

Mr. Karp said the highlighted text was currently referenced while reviewing the reformatting. He said those references would disappear when the document was finalized. He said cross referencing was something they were considering once the document was completed.

Councilor Pishioneri referred to page 81 of 143 and the increase in fines for Land and Drainage Alteration Permits to a criminal level. He asked if that was current with the new court fines that had recently been adopted.

Mr. Leahy said they would look at that to make sure it was still adequate. He said an adjustment was made to comply with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements, but those would be reviewed.

Councilor Pishioneri said he knew there was some revisions made and updating being done.

Mr. Leahy said they would check with Environmental Services Department (ESD) to make sure the amount complied with the EPA.

Councilor Ballew asked if there would be an index. Yes. She noted that Mohawk and Gateway were not mentioned.

Mr. Karp said the plans in Gateway and Glenwood were separate. Refinements plans were also separate and would stand on their own. There was a place held in the reformatting for those plans.

Councilor Ballew said the reformatting looked better. She suggested staff move ahead and not wait for the policies.

Mayor Leiken said he appreciated staff making this simpler. In order for someone to move things along, they would still need a good land use consultant and land use attorney. Having this reformatting in place could cut time for the developer. He asked about page 92 of 143 regarding Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District. He discussed measure 37 issues and asked if this language could affect this for the future of the City. He asked if the City would be o.k. with this language.

Mr. Leahy said one of the reasons these changes were housekeeping in nature rather than policy was to prevent Measure 37 claims. Staff didn't want to write a new code that would give Ballot Measure 37 claims substance.

Mr. Mott said part of the second part of the Mayor's question needed to be resolved by the Big Look group. They would need to consider the affect of recreating the system that existed prior to Senate Bill 100 that created the rural suburban communities around the boundary. The Urbanizable Fringe (UF10) was intended to say 'not to be annexed'. He discussed retrofitting those neighborhoods once they were annexed. With Ballot Measure 37, particularly with properties along the UGB, it started it all over again. He felt the City was better off to expand the UGB and include those properties. The Big Look would have to change the law to make that happen.

Mayor Leiken said the City Attorney and staff had done a great job for the City in land use planning. Work like this continued to simplify what the City had been trying to accomplish. Quality of life was a big issue. He thanked staff and the City Attorney for their work. This reformatting would make life simpler to move projects along.

Councilor Ralston referred to page 92 of 143. He said the easiest solution would be to increase the UGB. He asked if this made it easier or harder to develop in those areas.

Mr. Mott said this only applied within the UGB, between the city limits and the UGB. The City granted annexation when it was a logical extension for City services.

Councilor Ralston said the document did not note that it was within the UGB.

Mr. Karp said language could be added to clarify that in the document.

Councilor Woodrow thanked Mr. Mott and Mr. Karp.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:55 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder