

# Springfield Housing Needs Analysis



**Housing Stakeholder Committee**

**Wednesday, February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

# Tonight's Agenda

---

- Greetings & Background Info (5 minutes)
- Present Land Use Efficiency Measures Survey findings & Group Discussion (45 minutes)
- Finalize Group Consensus & Recommendation to PC (35 min.)
- Next Steps (5 minutes)

# Background

- January 7<sup>th</sup> – Land Use Efficiency Measure PC/Stakeholder packet sent out for review
- January 31<sup>st</sup> – Stakeholder meeting scheduled to review Efficiency Measures
  - Did not result in a quorum
  - Rescheduled for February 28<sup>th</sup>
- February 20<sup>th</sup> – PC worksession held to review initial survey results



# **Tonight's Goals**

- **Share results of on-line questionnaire**
- **Discuss land use efficiency measures**
- **Form consensus for a recommendation to the PC**
  - **Which measures to evaluate**
  - **Specific issues identified with measures**

# Measures Evaluated

---

- **Measures currently not implemented in Springfield**
  - Density bonuses
  - Transfer of development rights
  - Minimum lot sizes
  - Minimum density in LDR
  - Expedited review process
- **Measures partially or fully implemented Springfield**
  - Reduce street width standards
  - Allow small residential lots
  - Encourage infill and redevelopment
  - Nodal Development
  - Allow mixed-use development
  - Encourage transit-oriented design
  - Downtown revitalization
  - Accessory dwelling units
  - multi-family housing tax credits
  - Allow clustered residential development
  - Allow co-housing
  - Increase allowable residential densities
  - Allow duplexes, townhomes and condominiums in single-family zones

# Summary of Results

---

- Who responded?

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Planning Commission	56%	5
Housing Stakeholder Committee	33%	3
Other	11%	1

# Measures not implemented

Measure	Not Appropriate	Partially Appropriate	Always Appropriate
Density bonuses	0%	78%	22%
Transfer of development rights	11%	67%	22%
Minimum lot sizes	22%	33%	44%
Minimum density in LDR	11%	56%	44%
Expedited review process	22%	33%	44%

# Measures partially or fully implemented

Measure	No Change	Expand in	
		Some Instances	Expand in All Instances
Reduce street width standards	11%	56%	33%
Allow small residential lots	0%	56%	44%
Encourage infill and redevelopment	11%	44%	44%
Nodal Development	25%	25%	50%
Allow mixed-use development	22%	56%	22%
Encourage transit-oriented design	22%	56%	22%
Downtown revitalization	11%	56%	33%
Accessory dwelling units	11%	67%	22%
Multi-family housing tax credits	13%	75%	13%
Allow clustered residential development	11%	56%	33%
Allow co-housing	38%	25%	38%
Increase allowable residential densities	22%	56%	22%
Allow duplexes, townhomes and condominiums in single-family zones	33%	44%	22%



# Measures Not Implemented



# Density bonuses

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. Not appropriate in any circumstances	0.0%	0
2. Appropriate in some circumstances	77.8%	7
3. Appropriate in all circumstances	22.2%	2

appropriate when they work because of some added benefit such as promotes neighborhood livability, environmental concerns, etc.  
But not just because it's someone's good idea, and it will result in cad design, etc.

I understand that MUR zoning has no residential maximum densities, but is still regulated by building heights. I feel there are those developements that would be appropriate for highest densities possible as long as the projects would not be overly offensive to some neighbors, and in the proper settings with the city being the enforcement component. With the shortage of buildable residential land--I think this could work in some circumstances.

Higher densities than those allowed under the code may be appropriate in some cases and inappropriate in others. For example, an increase in density on steep slopes may not be feasible. Increasing the density in an area that has existing higher densities may be very appropriate.

This measure could be used to encourage higher density housing in some of the blighted areas of Springfield. Or maybe in south Springfield overlooking the river up on the hill. Definitely would require a review and possibly some building standards.

There needs to be some limitations in low-density residential to protect the investments and choices that others have made. This doesn't necessarily mean that smaller lot sizes and/or such things as small planned unit developments or cluster developments can't make sense under appropriate design criteria.

Density bonuses are only appropriate when the site characteristics are appropriate for highest densities; riparian areas, including flood plain and floodway, steep slopes, sensitive habitat areas, etc. are not appropriate areas for highest densities, and should never be allowed for high density siting to make up for conversion of other lands for uses not originally considered.

Density needs to increased in the next 20 years, and large lot preferences may decrease with an aging population. It will be great for forming more open spaces and in nodel development projects.

# Transfer of development rights

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. Not appropriate in any circumstance	11.1%	1
2. Appropriate in some circumstances	66.7%	6
3. Appropriate in all circumstances	22.2%	2

Review on a case by case situation.

I believe it is appropriate in all circumstances-it seems it would make perfect sense to be able to, at the City's descetion, transfer development from sensitive areas to more appropriate areas. This would create a win-win-situation!!

See comment above. Certainly concepts like cluster subdivisions often work well when they are appropriate.

Might be a way of encouraging open spaces along the river in Glenwood and more intense development across Franklin. I can't think of a lot of areas where this would apply.

Too bureaucratic and expensive to administer... prefer to just allow reasonable higher development density.

Springfield is awash in opportunities for redevelopment downtown and in Glenwood, but has all but decimated or overdeveloped most of it's natural resources by weakening provisions for riparian area setbacks, allowing tree removal, and marginalizing the value of sensitive species and sensitive habitat within city limits and the urban growth boundary; if the city valued the natural resource areas within it's jurisdictional responsibility, one mechanism to operationalize positive valuation of natural areas is transfer and purchase of development rights.

If the height limitation is removed in some sections of Springfield, this could be useful assuming that some outlying rural resources lands are annexed into the city. The best area for "high rises" would be the downtown area.

# Maximum Lot Sizes

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. Not appropriate in any circumstance	22.2%	2
2. Appropriate in some circumstances	33.3%	3
3. Appropriate in all circumstances	44.4%	4

Don't take a strong-arm approach, and will make people move outside Springfield, just like Eugene has done.

This is going to be so important for the City of Spfld to maximise the efficiencies and have an effective net density range per acre over the next 20 years

Eugene has a maximum lot size of 13,500 sq ft. However, the code allows for exceptions for topography, etc. I don't believe the maximum mandate is necessary. Realistically, given the cost of land, the vast majority of homes are constructed on lots well under the maximum lot size. However, there are people who want to build very expensive homes and we drive them out to the county. The code has a maximum lot coverage and whether lot coverage is measured by impervious surface or the footprint of the roof, in practical terms, the code can prevent the construction of very large residences. There are also people who want to large work shops and / or large gardens as part of their residences. People who want (and can afford) very large lots are very much the exception, but they should be able to build and live in Springfield if they want to do so.

Since I have a large lot in town, it is hard for me to think about a mandate for maximum lot size. Maybe if it were a part of a development where there were open spaces provided for children to play or residents to grow gardens. Some of the higher density standards such as smaller lot size discourages some of the health benefits of gardening, growing your own vegetables and children having a place to get more physical exercise. Maybe incorporating small lots with community gardens and more neighborhood parks and walking and bike paths should be a goal.

I might consider this with a maximum size of 10,000sf on flat lots but would have to allow exceptions for slopes. Don't think it really would have any impact since most recent developments have gone for smaller lots anyway.

In no circumstance should the city keep large sized properties in family zones. The market should dictate the size of lots for properties in city limits. Allowing a maximum size will keep valuable properties from developing in Springfield.

appropriate in most, if not all, circumstances; the maximum lot size should be between 4500 and 5500 square feet, except possibly in areas of slopes between 20-25%, where maximum lot sizes could be as large as 6000 - 7000 sq. ft. The lower limits of the ldr zoning classification need to be enforced overall in ever circumstance- Springfield needs to enforce it's code, rather than continuing past practices of weaking code provisions and waiving provisions in reponse to the desires of particular developers.

This should be ratcheted in if other measures prove unsuccessful at control urban sprawl in say five years. Again, the aging boomers don't need the large lots any more.

# Minimum Density in LDR

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. Not appropriate in any circumstance	11.1%	1
2. Appropriate in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. Appropriate in all circumstances	33.3%	3

This should take care of itself in staying within code

I think it is appropriate in some areas to have an overlay zone that requires an overall density that is higher than the base zone. I don't think that you need to impose a maximum lot size. Rather, a developer in the overlay zone would have to create lots with with average sizes that meet the density requirements.

similar thinking as question 3. A balance between density and shared open spaces.

See prior comment. Prefer to just allow smaller lot sizes.

Forcing high density would keep desirable properties from being developed in areas that could develop faster if a lower density is in place. Again, the market should dictate residential densities in existing city limits.

There is no reason why enforcing minimum densities in the ldr zone should be considered differently from enforcing densities in other residential zones; large lots are for rural lane county - resource constraints, climate change, rising energy costs must be considered as parameters for development decisions sooner rather than later.

Do it. no brainer for LDR. If the houses can't see, then think about revising it. See write up, especially as to "reduce sprawl, eliminate underbuilding and make services more affordable." Easy to implement.



# Expedite Project Review

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. Not appropriate in any circumstance	22.2%	2
2. Appropriate in some circumstances	33.3%	3
3. Appropriate in all circumstances	44.4%	4

Sometimes planner terms make for neighborhoods people dont want to live in. Also, we want to promote infill, and breaking down some larger lots. Smart growth might make things cost too much and only be feasible on a larger piece of land.

I think this is always a good policy. anytime we can speed up a process which makes good sense is a good thing. Just as long as we can do this process without discrimination.

Whether this is appropriate or not depends on what type of streamlining you are talking about. If it means that the actual application process is streamlined, that would be very appropriate (the question then becomes "If the process can be streamlined for these projects, why can't it be streamlined for all projects?") On the other hand, if streamlining means that Smart Growth projects get to go to the front of the line for review by staff, that is inappropriate under all circumstances. All projects are time sensitive, and delaying other projects that were submitted first is inappropriate.

I think we already have an efficient permit approval process in Springfield. How would #5 make a difference?

Interesting idea, but I don't think it would make much difference since such project really need more design oversight.

Saving labor on processing and faster turnaround is great for municipalities and the public.

Not appropriate without implementation of strong and consistent expectations and provisions (including those addressing design and density issues) that reflect well established and implementable policies that clearly define what 'smart growth projects' are, the goal of those projects, and the community benefit of those projects.

Marcola Meadows is not 'smart growth', for example. How smart can it be to site big box retail/commercial outlets within a mile or less of other big box home stores; merely promising some high density residential development opportunities, with minimal if any adequate design standards, does not necessarily translate into something 'smart'

no brainer

# Measures Partially or Fully Implemented



# Reduce Street Width Standards

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	11.1%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	33.3%	3

All is a hard word to implement, because there can be situations where even the best idea doesn't make sense.

I am ok with most streets in Springfield, although I don't want to see streets as narrow as some streets in Eugene. I feel it unsafe in some situations.

Narrower streets have advantages but there is also a safety issue. Children darting out into the street between parked cars are more at risk with narrower streets, and in some areas it has been a problem.

In the picture provided, it did not appear that density of housing was changed by street width but rather more planting area and trees in the planting strip made a nicer looking neighborhood and a more livable community.

While planners like narrower streets, often the residents complain about traffic dangers, for example, Northgate was designed in the 1960s with narrow streets to make the neighborhood safer. During the 1990s, the neighbors complained to the City Council about kids being hit by cars because of parking along the streets. I think the 28 foot street is the smallest two-way that should be allowed in most circumstances.

With great design and careful code wording can create a great saving in dense areas.

Street designs need to at the very least take into account our resource constrained future and the probability that drivers of large single family vehicles will be less and less able to afford to maintain existing driving behavior, and thus the need for streets to accommodate huge fast moving fossil-fuel fueled vehicles will diminish.

Where is the policy direction that establishes that reducing street widths on collectors and arterials is not recommended?

Street width reductions should be integrated with neighborhood appropriate street design elements

barring connectors we don't need more asphalt!

# Allow Small Lots

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	0.0%	0
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	44.4%	4

This is a good idea, and may be the only way to make things affordable. The more it exists, the more acceptable it will come.

I think this should always be an option to look at but it may be inappropriate in some circumstances - steep slopes, areas that are already congested, etc.

Does the city control the footprint of the house on the lot aside from mandating minimum side, back, and front yards? Small lots should encourage creative use of space when designing the home built there.

I think we should allow lots as small as 3500sf with more allowed lot coverage. We should explore small cluster developments with up to 6 or 8 lots using a single driveway such as found on G street near 20th.

the use of small residential lots should be expanded within the city limits; providing urban services is becoming more and more expensive, making it less and less sensible to continue large lot, low density, sprawl development that doesn't consider long term climate and energy implications.

It is also the case that many springfield homebuyers are spending more than 1/3 of their gross income on their mortgage; smaller lot sizes will contribute to more affordable homes overall.

More density in the City, means a smaller UGB expansion.

# Encourage Infill and Redevelopment

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	11.1%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	44.4%	4
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	44.4%	4

makes good sense to reuse land within developed areas--where services are already provided. A good efficient use of land.

Maintaining neighborhood character is always an issue. Too much infill, particularly if it results in the number of rental units significantly exceeding the owner-occupied homes, can be a problem. On the other hand, using land as efficiently as possible is a very good thing if it doesn't detract from the use and enjoyment of others.

I would think the cost of land would be the driving factor for people to create more lots on existing lots. The cost of subdividing lots makes this impractical for some property owners.

In applying infill and redevelopment policies, it is imperative to have corresponding design criteria, site development criteria, and/or overlay zone criteria that will help ensure that goals for density, reduction in v.m.t., etc. can actually be achieved.

If infill and redevelopment have a low bar for design and site development criteria, it is unlikely the city will be successful in achieving redevelopment and infill goals.

Infill and redevelopment should be incentivized, especially in the city's downtown core area

Same as above



# Nodal Development

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	25.0%	2
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	25.0%	2
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	50.0%	4

I don't have an opinion.

I think we are finding out that they are not as easy to do as was originally thought and many of the obstacles are outside of the city's control. For example, one of the biggest obstacles are the number of landowners involved. Expanding the policy won't change that.

This could really help the Urban Renewal push.

This is a difficult strategy because of the reluctance of the finance market but worth promoting in certain areas such as Mohawk.

Implement nodal development in all designated nodal areas

First and foremost, the city must reintroduce the concept that nodal development must include a walkability element as well as functioning to reduce v.m.t. Plopping a big box retail/commercial development in the middle of a field and filling in the surrounding developable area with a strip mall and medium and high density development (and dubbing the resulting 'mix' as an urban village) doesn't in and of itself result in nodal development. Locating a large commercial/retail outlet within a 1/2 mile or so of a regional transportation system, thus encouraging many trips from outside the area for purpose of shopping at the big box retail/commercial outlet, and trying to frame the ensuing development as a village or a node does a disservice to efforts to create more livable cities through better designed and denser developments and through implementation of measures that contribute to reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

More "neighborhoods" less CO2 more density

# Allow Mixed-Use Development

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	22.2%	2
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	22.2%	2

like the marcola meadows---it is a great idea to see a little village within a city--less travel--efficient way of life

Mixed use is very appropriate but only in very limited areas. To the extent that it is practical, it should be an option. Planning mix use developments in areas that can't support it or where it would be incompatible with existing uses is not a good idea.

Again this type of development could benefit the greater Urban Renewal push.

See comment on #4 above.

When the city allows a developer to use mixed use zoning as a way to achieve density goals that would otherwise be compromised as a result of the 'commercial nature' of the said development consuming a large portion of the proposed development area, especially when that development area was planned primarily for residential or other noncommercial uses, the intent of mixed use is always compromised. The use of mixed use zoning should be considered in conjunction with the goals of the comprehensive plan and nodal development policies, rather than as a way to provide flexibility for a developer.

Prevent transportation use, need to go vertical for density reduction

# Transit-Oriented Development

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	22.2%	2
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	22.2%	2

In the near future masstransit is going to become more popular.

I don't see fuel costs going down in the future. The more we can make trnsportation efficient the better

Mass transit works well in Springfield in limited areas - Martin Luther King Blvd, Gateway, Franklin Blvd, and Main Street. Maybe Mohawk. Once you get very far off those arterials, transit-oriented design and development patterns probably aren't practical and won't be for the foreseeable future.

This land use measure could be particularly helpful in developing the Glenwood area.

Good concept but the market will drive it. What makes it work is the tax incentive.

Along existing and planned transit routes

The city should be looking for resources to support expansion of transit oriented policies and projects, rather than pursuing an outdated model of funding for expanding freeway systems to serve urban sprawl. In addition, if the city continues implementation of sprawl policies such as land banking through 'development' of large surface parking areas, talk of transit oriented development will be nothing more than lip service.

more bus riders- less cars, less pollution- again, can go vertical.

# Downtown Revitalization

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	11.1%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	33.3%	3

Springfield is in diar need of cleanup in the downtown area--then I may want to visit it more often. Give me an incentive to come downtown

Getting more downtown housing would be great.

I note the ease of implementation as being difficult in most categories. Revitalization is not an easy endeavor but one worthy of effort. Any policies that make this possible should be explored. Obviously the people of Springfield see revitalization as a worthwhile goal. Just think how close the downtown area will be to the new basketball arena being planned by the University. Especially with the EmX bus line. And what a beautiful urban park we already have next to the river.

This decision was already made by Springfield Voters!

The urban renewal district geographic area is very large, making it potentially difficult to focus funding priorities where needed most. The city might consider sub-districts if allowable as a tool to direct funding ASAP to the 'core' downtown area.

some, everywhere may not be doable

# Accessory Dwelling Units

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	11.1%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	66.7%	6
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	22.2%	2

I am in favor of this, only if the Primary dwelling is owner-occupied. Also only where cc&r's allow.

Giving people more options to reasonably add small dwelling units on an existing lot would be a good thing.

I have a number of these examples on my street in houses less than 3 years old. They tend to work well. In this instances, the second units really are nothing more than apartments rented to help the primary owners pay the mortgage.

In the low density residential zones ADU's might be considered for density bonus incentives

Neighbors, with appropriate screening can be neighbors.



# Multifamily Tax Credits

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	12.5%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	75.0%	6
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	12.5%	1

don't know
In <u>some instances it may work</u> in Springfield--but I don't think our City is large enough.
If it can be expanded, and I don't know that it can be, it should be. Springfield doesn't have the money to provide local tax credits, but developers should be able to <u>fully utilize any state and / or federal tax credits</u> available.
<u>Limited circumstances!</u> There must be a benefit to the city at least equal if not greater than the tax credit provided. I would want some strings attached that would insure the property was well maintained during the period of tax credit. I would not want developers to simply be collecting profits. I realize there may be some risk for the developer involved in investing in an urban area but I would not like to see absentee landlords with no interest in Springfield become majority land holders simply because they were getting a tax credit.
Good tool used in <u>targeted, limited fashion</u> such as in the Downtown and allow transit corridors.
First ensure that the land use code has <u>criteria for design standards</u> that benefits residents of multifamily housing units, including aesthetic features, common areas for open space and utilitarian needs such as laundry, day care, etc.
<u>Depends on the tipping point of the project.</u> If it turns out to be a windfall for developer, that is not right.

# Allow Cluster Development

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	11.1%	1
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	33.3%	3

Very much in favor of this---with the residential land left- allot of it is in some steep terrain -This would allow for cluster building with some scenic hills and less erosion or hazzardous problems.

This should be an option whenever it is practical.

Again, with adequate and appropriate requirements for design

We are doing some of this, we should make it more widespread throughtout the City.

# Allow Co-Housing

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	37.5%	3
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	25.0%	2
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	37.5%	3

I don't know--how many people want to live this way, really.

I don't know how much Springfield currently allows for co-housing. It is an appropriate option in areas of higher densities.

I don't think this is particularly viable but wouldn't preclude it.

And look for ways to use co-housing developments as models for other types of high density projects

# Increase Allowable Densities

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	22.2%	2
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	55.6%	5
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	22.2%	2

as code allows--and maybe look at the code to expand a bit---I think this would allow for more affordable housing and an efficient way to utilize our precious land supply

Except on steep slopes, Springfield allows lot sizes of 5,000 and 4,500 square feet, depending on the street orientation. Springfield should allow 4500 square foot lots throughout R-1 zoning.

Design matters!

Again, allow smaller lots

Only in areas where there is sufficient capacity of all facilities.

If the market presents itself to encourage a higher density. then we should facilitate the ease of the market mechanism.

With appropriate design criteria as parameters for development; it is past time to require developers to build at higher densities; energy, climate change, and resource availability constraints will only continue to grow, not recede.

# Allow Duplexes, etc...

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1. The City should not change this policy	33.3%	3
2. The City should seek ways to expand this policy in some circumstances	44.4%	4
3. The City should seek ways to apply this policy in all circumstances	22.2%	2

I feel there is a good mix of zoning, although we can continue looking at ways to increase the overall density of this type of development.

Developers should be able to have a certain mix of housing types within a low-density subdivision. For example, 10% of the subdivision dwelling units could be multi-family units, etc. Eugene does this and I have never heard of any problems, although I also do not know how much it is used in the subdivision versus PUD process.

We have a pretty flexible policy now, won't change

In cases where mixed use development, redevelopment, and/or infill projects are appropriately sited and designed

improve density, apply design standards to keep compatible with the neighborhood.



# Next Steps

---

- Present Stakeholder recommendation to PC on March 18<sup>th</sup>
- Calculate estimated impacts of efficiency measures

# Questions?

