



SPRINGFIELD
DEVELOPMENT CODE
UPDATE PROJECT

MEETING AGENDA

City of Springfield
Development Code Update Project

Community Technical Advisory Committee - Housing

Monday, March 11, 2019

3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Library Conference Room

Springfield City Hall, 225 Fifth Street

Item	Time	Subject	Lead
1	3:00	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agenda• Meeting Objectives	Mark Rust
2	3:05	Overview of Project Scope and Schedule	Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting
3	3:15	Housing Development Code Audit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methodology• Key Issues	Anais Mathez
4	3:30	Housing Development Code Audit: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Land Use Districts• Infrastructure Development Standards• Site Development Standards• Specific Development Standards• Development Review Process	Elizabeth Decker JET Planning
5	4:45	Next Steps	Mark Rust
6	5:00	Adjourn	All



SPRINGFIELD

**DEVELOPMENT CODE
UPDATE PROJECT**

MEMORANDUM

To: Mark Rust, City of Springfield

CC: Community TAC Members
Kristina Kraaz, City of Springfield
Brenda Jones, City of Springfield

From: Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning
Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting

Date: February 28, 2019

Project Name: Clear & Objective Housing Standards Review
RE: Draft Code Audit

Introduction

The code audit is part of the City's overall, multiyear effort to fully update the Development Code. The audit will inform and guide the drafting of new housing standards to be adopted as part of the first package of code amendments. The code update process is intended to be a full rewrite process.

The purpose of the Development Code Update project is to change the Springfield Development Code (SDC) to support efficient, timely, and clear development review. The updated Development Code will support Springfield's economic development priorities and will honor Springfield's home town feel now and in the future.

The clear and objective housing standards review, as a first phase of the Development Code Update Process, will audit all applicable standards to identify concerns about whether a clear and objective review option exists for all residential development, to identify significant regulatory barriers to residential development, and to identify additional regulatory opportunities to support the development of desired types identified in the City's Housing Needs Analysis. The SDC contains many different sections that apply to housing. Standards include base zone standards, design and development standards, infrastructure standards, and development review process standards, including project approval criteria. The overarching goal for the code audit is to identify regulatory barriers to the development of a wide variety of housing types in compliance with both the letter and the spirit of Oregon's clear and objective requirements, to better meet the City's identified needs for housing.

State law requires a "clear and objective" review path for all housing, which may not cause "unreasonable cost or delay." This requirement applies to all housing types within residential and mixed-use zones in Springfield, referred to in state law very broadly as "needed housing." A "clear and objective" review path means that there is only one way to interpret a standard, so that there is no discretion when applying it. However, cities may develop an optional review path with discretionary standards as an alternative to the clear and objective review path and there are limited exemptions to the clear and objective requirement, notably for historic districts.

Code Audit Format & Methodology

The code audit findings highlight both those areas of the code that are functioning effectively, as well as those that cause concerns or barriers to efficient, timely, and clear development, with an emphasis on the latter. Generally, the standards that cause the most concerns are the primary topics of discussion.

Given that the City intends to write primarily new development code standards, rather than targeted edits to the existing standards, many of the audit findings are broad commentary on existing uses, standards, and review processes, rather than line-by-line analysis of the existing standards.

This draft audit focuses on identifying the primary areas of code relating to housing development, with initial analysis on whether the language appears to support a clear and objective path for development and whether it creates any additional barriers to development, balanced against community priorities to maintain a home town feel and promote quality development. The final audit will include significantly more detail on the identified code standards and potential alternative approaches.

The draft audit findings integrate analysis by the consultant team, background from the project manager and City staff provided at a January 28, 2019 focus group, and community input from the Community TAC provided at their January 28, 2019 meeting. Further Community TAC and staff feedback at the upcoming March 11th meeting will be used to refine the draft findings for the final audit, due at the end of May. Community TAC and staff feedback is particularly desired to prioritize code sections in need of more detailed review, to provide context about how standards are applied during development, as well as to identify potential models or examples for future code standards.

Detailed Audit Findings

Code organizational and overarching issues

- The "EXCEPTION" language, used extensively in the existing code, could be rewritten to integrate into the text of the standard itself, calling less attention to the exception with more focus on the standard. Generally, offering exceptions to standards, even if they incorporate discretionary language, do not run afoul of state requirements for clear and objective standards provided that there is a clear standard as the base requirement. For example, a standard may require 15% window coverage on the front façade, except that an alternative glazing pattern may be approved if it provides a similar level of visual connection between the street and buildings. In addition, exceptions should specify how the alternative proposal should be reviewed, through something like an adjustment process or site plan review, rather than simply delegating authority to the Director.
- Generally, code standards that grant authority to the Director to approve an alternative design should be rewritten to specific when and how an alternative design can be approved, ideally referencing an established land use process such as an adjustment. For example, allowing three different materials for fences or "an alternative that equally meets privacy needs as approved by the Director," provides too much discretion to the Director and not enough certainty for code users. The requirement for clear and objective standards can be met by listing the three approved materials, and flexibility can then be provided by offering an alternative review path.
- Organization of special residential development standards could be improved for greater clarity and ease of use. For example, just as the multi-unit design standards are integrated into the residential zone sections, the ADU design and development standards could be integrated into the residential zone sections. Many of the specific development standards in Section 4.7-100 that apply to residential uses, such as duplexes, could also be integrated into the residential standards.
- Some residential compatibility standards are applicable when there are nearby single-family detached residences, and other times standards apply for sites adjacent to the property zones LDR or other residential zones. Recommended approach is to consistently use adjacency to LDR

zone (or other desired zones) as the applicability trigger for additional standards, rather than the development type on a specific lot which can be inconsistent with the current zoning and purpose.

Land Use Districts (Chapter 3)

- *Residential zones (Section 3.2-200)*
 - *Residential Zoning Districts (3.2-205):*
 - Requirement for a Refinement Plan and a Master Plan to implement the Small Lot Residential District (SLR) appears to be a barrier to applying the zone and realizing opportunities for smaller lot residential development at the desired density range of 8-14 units per acre.
 - Minimum and maximum densities included in the district definitions appear to be the only place where density standards are listed; this is an unusual place to locate them.
 - *Use Categories (3.2-210):* Few concerns noted. Consider opportunities for additional missing middle housing types, in more zones, with less review required. For example, the only residential uses that can be developed in the MDR and HDR zones without a Type II Site Plan Review are single-family detached residential, ADUs, and duplexes; this could encourage development of these lower-density options rather than higher-density options.
 - Cottage cluster housing is not permitted outright as a use; there may be an intention to permit it through cluster subdivisions, but cottage housing is a separate defined term in 6.1-110.
 - *Base Zone Development Standards (3.2-215):* The dimensional standards here are not as clear as they could be, given the number of notes and exceptions. It is not clear when some of the exceptions apply, for example, lot coverage for MDR and HDR is set at 45% but can be increased to meet the density requirements, per note (17), without detail about how to qualify for the increase. Another general observation is that standards for the MDR and HDR appear fairly restrictive, creating potential barriers to development; at a minimum they could create uncertainty for development because it is not clear when the exceptions detailed in the notes for lot coverage, height and similar allowances would be approved for a project. Specific standards worth further consideration include:
 - Differentiated lot sizes for single-family and duplex development based on orientation of the street are unusual, and may create complications for development; balance underlying policy goals against simplicity of a single lot size standard.
 - The alternative dimensions for Hillside Development and Urbanizable Fringe Overlay Districts could be relocated in the respective chapters, to simplify this table.
 - MDR and HDR standards including the 45% maximum lot coverage, 35-foot maximum height, and 4,500 to 9,000-SF minimum lot size appear fairly restrictive for the uses and density ranges desired. Exceptions, some tied to the Multi-unit Design Standards in Section 3.2-240, may allow greater intensity development, but not clear based on this table.
 - Density minimums and maximums are not included in this table or elsewhere, aside from the district definitions in 3.2-205, and are only inferred by minimum lot size.
 - *Panhandle Lot Standards (3.2-220):* No significant concerns.

- *Base Solar Development Standards (3.2-225)*: These add considerable complexity to the allowed height and required setbacks in each zone, and have potential to require relatively high setbacks—in excess of 20 feet for many developments—which impacts development potential of a site and may be a barrier to development. Applicability of standards to base zones could be clearer.
- *Cluster Subdivision Standards (3.2-230)*: The purpose of the cluster subdivision standard is not clear, and may not be effectively implemented through the development standards in this section. Often, cluster subdivisions are used for additional flexibility that may include higher densities and/or additional residential uses, to allow infill development on lots of a few acres that are too small to allow traditional subdivisions with public roads and minimum lot frontage for every lot. There is potential for cluster subdivisions to support cottage housing developments, but it is not clear in this chapter whether that is intended or possible. There are some standards for cottage housing incorporated into its definition in Section 6.1-100, which could be better addressed here, if the intent for two uses is indeed similar. DLCDC has opined that cluster subdivisions can be exempt from the clear and objective standards requirement, because it offers an alternative path to uses allowed outright, but certainly clear standards could remove uncertainty and potentially reduce barriers to development.
 - Clarify density allowances for cluster subdivisions, and consider allowing an increase over the base zone. Section A.4 states that clusters shall not exceed the minimum density in the base zone, but the standards are written to allow higher density development to support greater affordability and reduced lot sizes. The neighborhood compatibility standards in Section F explicitly tie the need for those standards to the higher densities allowed in the cluster subdivisions—without permitting higher densities.
 - Consider whether cluster subdivision standards are intended to accomplish similar goals as cottage housing standards, or whether they should be treated as separate uses and processes.
 - Allowing a range of dwelling types, including single-family detached, single-family attached and duplexes in the LDR zone per Section D, allows additional flexibility relative to the LDR base zone.
 - There are currently few limits on reductions and modifications to dimensional standards, in Section E. While this provides flexibility, there could be concerns about how much reduction could be permitted, and how to support approval or denial of a proposal. If the goal is to use these standards to support cottage housing development, more explicit dimensional standards could be introduced for more specificity. If intended to support cottage housing style development with lots fronting a common green rather than a public road, add explicit provisions for reduced or eliminated minimum lot frontage requirements.
 - The neighborhood compatibility standards in Section F, while seemingly clear and objective, could create a significant barrier to development by requiring up to 25-foot setbacks around the perimeter of the cluster, which significantly exceeds the setbacks in the LDR base zone. Consider whether there is significantly greater intensity of use possible through the cluster subdivision ordinance that merits additional setbacks, or reduce to align with base zone standards. For example, the additional height transition requirement for projects adjacent to single-story buildings requires up a 25-ft setback for two-story buildings that would not apply to a traditional single-family detached home built through the base zone standards, allowed up to 30 feet tall with as little as 5-10-foot setbacks.
 - Design standards for dwellings in Section G appear reasonably clear and

achievable; notably, they do not require a front porch which is a common feature of cottage housing design standards. They could be further reviewed for consistency with residential design standards in Section 4.7-100, or other cottage housing standards, if desired.

- Application of a landscape buffer option as a condition of approval in Section J is discretionary, seemingly based on whether concerns about buffering are raised during the review process. Consider developing a specific standard for buffering, if so desired, or removing discretionary option.
- *Residential Manufactured Dwellings (3.2-235):*
 - Integrate standards for manufactured homes currently located in the definitions section. Standards requiring a minimum size of 1,000 SF for manufactured homes limit options for smaller housing options, including tiny homes.
 - Review standards for manufactured home parks for compliance with state building code standards. Consider simplifying the city standards to address only issues outside of the state building code, to avoid conflicts. Generally, standards will be applied to existing parks seeking modifications rather than new manufactured home parks (land values and development economics disfavor new parks), so focus on local standards that support redevelopment of existing parks without triggering nonconformity concerns.
- *Multi-unit Design Standards (3.2-240):* Multi-unit standards must be clear and objective, and aim to achieve quality development as experienced by both future residents and abutting property owners, while keeping development costs reasonable to ensure that projects will “pencil” and will actually get built. Generally the standards appear reasonable and consistent with other jurisdictions; exceptions are noted below.
 - Design standards are currently “one size fits all” for projects with three or more units, which can create barriers to development of smaller projects under 20 units or so.
 - Requirement for Type II review in Section C could be changed to a Type I review; assuming all standards are indeed clear and objective, it should be possible to review projects through a Type I process. The option to elevate review to Type III review “when it is in the public interest” does not appear to guarantee a clear and objective review path for all development and should be removed.
 - The LDR compatibility standards in Section D.3 require significant site area to be devoted to setbacks, which can be a barrier to development. The exception to compliance with the standards for LDR-sites committed to a long-term non-residential use could be worded more clearly. Matching the front setback to adjacent development can reduce buildable area, and creates less certainty for multifamily development given that it depends on site-specific conditions. The 25-foot buffer area standards should be reviewed for intent and effectiveness; it is a large area, that can be further increased up to 50 feet for buildings 50 feet tall, with significant impacts to site development feasibility. The development allowed in the buffer area does not seem to support a consistent rationale for the buffer area, raising questions about its effectiveness. For example, landscaping requirements that could provide more effective buffering are vague, and rely upon discretion to determine what mix of planting, fencing, and acoustical barriers are required. The buffer area can be counted towards the open space requirement, but cannot be developed for active recreation areas, which may decrease the usability of the buffer area.

- Open space standards in Section D.5 could benefit from greater clarity of purpose and relationship to other standards. The overlap is not clear between the minimum 15% open space requirement here and minimum 15% site landscaping required in Section D.6; if they are presumably the same 15% of the site, then the standards are duplicative, and if they are not, there are concerns about how much total site is taken up to meet the two requirements. The overall minimum 15% open space requirement, inclusive of yards and some provisions for resource areas, appears reasonable, but it is not easy to calculate whether the common and private open space requirements are high enough that it drives the total site area above 15% after accounting for yards. There may be opportunities to reduce the cumulative impact of setbacks, buffer areas, common and private open space, and landscaping standards, but it is difficult to determine their combined footprint and impact on development feasibility as the standards are currently written.
- Planting requirements in Section D.6.a are not clear about the desired ratio of trees, shrubs and other plant materials, only an overall percentage, and may not lead to a desired mix.
- Parking requirements in Section D.8 should be evaluated for overlap with parking standards for all development in Section 4.6-100, and consider combining. As currently written, there appears to be minimal overlap, but many of the multi-unit standards are common features of parking codes and could be rewritten into a central parking chapter. Lighting requirement in Section D.8.b should specify a foot-candle lighting level rather than "for safety purposes." Standard to reduce stormwater runoff "as practicable" in Section D.8.j is not clear; the goal is likely addressed through separate stormwater standards and may not be needed here.
- Vehicular circulation standards in Section D.9 could benefit from greater clarity or connection to related standards, specifically for the shared driveway standard in subsection b, to be provided "where practicable," and the alley requirement in subsection d, when alleys can "reasonably be extended."
- The regulatory and descriptive power of the figures at the end of the section is not clear. Repetition of the same figure in Figures 3.2-L, M, Q and R with different text and arrows provides little additional benefit. There are also some inconsistencies between the text and the figures, such as Figure 3.2-N specifies a maximum building length of 160 feet for 1-2 story buildings, and 120-foot length for 3 stories and taller, however, Section D.2.a only includes the former standard and does not appear to include a standard for taller buildings.
- *Multi-unit Discretionary Criteria (3.2-245):* This section provides an option to comply with alternative design discretionary criteria in place of the clear and objective standards in Section 3.2-240. These criteria appear to have a good one-to-one correspondence with the design standards, no significant concerns about content. Review requirements in 3.2-245.A could be clearer to explain what combination of design standards, these discretionary criteria, and adjustments in Section 3.2-250 can be applied to a given project, whether a mix is permissible or if a project must comply with all of one track or the other.
- *Multi-unit Design Standards Variance (3.2-250):* This section provides a third option to satisfy the design objectives for multi-unit development, through an adjustment to the design standards, which is a welcome option. Many cities require either full compliance with clear standards or with discretionary criteria; the option to adjust one problematic standard rather than subjecting the entire project to discretionary guidelines should provide a meaningful "release valve." However, the section could benefit from

clarification about the exact procedural options; Section 3.2-250.A allows adjustments up to 20% by the Director, presumably a Type II review, and requires greater adjustments to comply with a Type III Major Variance process in Section 5.21-130, which is presumably the same as the Planning Commission review of adjustments referenced in Section 3.2-245.A. The general approval criteria for all adjustments in Section 3.2-250.B, allowing adjustments only for unusual site features not of the applicant's own making, could merit further review to determine whether it limits the utility of the adjustment option.

- *Commercial zones (Section 3.2-300)*: Residential uses in commercial zones should be permitted through a clear and objective process, and it does not appear that this requirement is met. The use table in Section 3.2-210 and referenced Section 4.7-210 could provide greater clarity about where residential uses are permitted in the commercial zones, rather than referencing separate map designations. Additional clarity on the applicable development standards that apply to residential development would also be helpful, in place of the reference in Section 4.7-210.A to "MDR and HDR District standards." MDR and HDR standards are not identical; for example, would development be allowed at the density permitted for MDR or HDR? The references to mixed use designations and mixed use zoning in Section 4.7-210.A and B are also confusing, considering that they are intended to apply to areas with commercial zoning: if mixed-use zoning is desired, those properties should be rezoned rather than a roundabout application of mixed-use standards in commercial districts.
- *Mixed Use zones (Section 3.2-600)*: Residential uses in mixed-use zones should be permitted through a clear and objective process, and it does not appear that this requirement is met.
 - *Uses (3.2-610)*: A mix of residential uses from rowhouses to multiple family dwellings is permitted across the mixed use districts, though the limitation that such uses are only permitted in "Areas Designated Mixed-Use in the Metro Plan or Refinement Plans" rather than permitted based on the base zone could be simplified.
 - *Base Development Standards (3.2-615)*:
 - The dimensional standards for the MUR zone reference the residential development standards in Sections 3.2-215 and 3.2-225, but do not clearly identify which set of residential standards apply, whether it's for the LDR or HDR zone.
 - Note 1 grants the Director the discretion to waive requirement for minimum lot frontage. Because there is a clear and objective standard in the table for lot frontage, an alternative discretionary standard is permissible. Usability could be improved by specifying the process through which the Director can grant the exception.
 - *Conflicts and Exemptions (3.2-620)*: The exemption process in Section B allows the Director to approve exemptions, presumably through a Type II process; but this section could more clearly define the required review process and criteria for an exemption from the standards rather than "to the Director's satisfaction."
 - *Development Standards (3.2-625)*: Mixed-use districts are explicitly required to apply clear and objective standards to residential uses, which is a departure from earlier state legal requirements and a substantial challenge to translate the design objectives of many mixed-use districts into clear and objective language, particularly for buildings with a true mix of uses where a mix of standards could apply. This section offers two options, compliance with the standards or an alternative design that equally or better meets the intent; this could be the foundation for developing a two-track set of standards including a clear and objective option and a discretionary alternative. However, the existing text needs additional clarification about the distinction between the two sets of standards and the required reviews for each, as well as additional clarity throughout the individual

standards to remove discretionary language.

- The standards incorporate considerable subjectivity, particularly those for Building Design Standards, Street Connectivity, and Neighborhood Compatibility.
- It is not clear which of the standards apply to a residential building or residential portion of a mixed-use building. Some standards such as the ground-floor window requirements in Section A.1 and 2 are differentiated for commercial, civic and industrial uses, but do not include a standard for residential uses. The only standard that specifically applies to “mixed-use residential development” is the weather protection standard in Section C.
- *Specific Development Standards (3.2-630):*
 - The percentages of commercial and residential uses allowed per Section A.1.b could be better expressed; the allowance for up to 100% residential uses is not possible to achieve given that 60% of the ground floor must be used for commercial uses.
 - The requirement in Section C.4 for MUR residential uses to also meet the multi-unit design standards in addition to the mixed-use standards in Section 3.2-625 is a concern. Applying two sets of standards is at best overkill and at worst conflicting.
 - The allowed density in the MUR district of 12-20 units per gross acre minimum with no maximum appears consistent with the medium and high-density districts. However, the residential districts express density in units per net acre, with minimums of 14-28 units per net acre per Section 3.2-205.C and D; density should be measured consistently for easier alignment.
- *Willamette Greenway Overlay District (3.3-300):* The requirement for a Discretionary Use permit and application of discretionary greenway standards in Section 3.3-325, which are directly derived from the state’s Goal 15 language do not provide a clear and objective option for residential development. However, greenway uses are limited to water-dependent and water-related uses, which do not generally include residences, as defined in Section 6.1-110. There is residential and mixed-use land within the Willamette Greenway where some minimum development allowance subject to clear and objective standards should be developed, including clarity about allowed residential uses.
- *Floodplain Overlay District (3.3-400):* Overlay affects some residential properties, thus requiring option for a clear and objective review path. Type I permits are required to demonstrate compliance with general and specific residential criteria in Sections 3.3-420.A and B.1, which generally appear to provide a clear and objective development option.
- *Hillside Development Overlay District (3.3-500):* Standards apply to sites or portions of sites that are over 670 feet in elevation or with average slopes exceeding 15%. There are two options for residential development in Section 3.3-520 to determine allowable lot sizes and density, an allowable minimum based on average slopes or a density transfer option; both sets of standards appear clear and objective. The minimum lot sizes in Table 3.3-1 repeat those in Section 3.2-215, and could be limited to this chapter to avoid duplication. The geotechnical report requirements in Section 3.3-530.A could be a concern because they rely on professional engineering judgment to demonstrate that lots are “suitable for development” and impose “the minimum variance from the natural conditions,” among other discretionary standards.
- *Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District (3.3-800):* The limited development options in this overlay generally provide a clear and objective option for residential development, however, some of the restrictions to ensure future development at urban densities are not clear. Specifically, Section 3.3-825.D.2 allowing the application of “Additional development restrictions that limit the location of buildings and on-site sewage disposal facilities shall be applied where necessary to reserve

land for future urban development," appears discretionary.

- *Nodal Development Overlay District (3.3-1000)*: This overlay imposes additional design standards on single family and duplex residential in Section 3.3-1025.A, which include some discretionary language that should be further reviewed to ensure a clear and objective option exists for all residential development.
- *Glenwood Riverfront Mixed-Use Plan District (3.4-200) and Booth-Kelly Mixed Use Plan District (3.4-300)*: Residential uses are allowed in significant portions of these plan districts, without a clear and objective option for development. The district standards were developed to implement the Refinement Plan for the areas, which includes broader, discretionary goals that may not translate as easily into clear and objective standards. However, the expanded requirement for a clear and objective option for all residential in mixed-use areas will require revised standards for these plan districts.

Infrastructure Development Standards (Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

- The central challenge is to determine that balance between the infrastructure improvement standards that should be located in this chapter of the development code, and those that should be located in the engineering standards (EDSPM). While a complete audit of infrastructure standards is outside the scope of this audit, some general guidelines include:
 - Design issues that relate to land use approvals, such as tentative subdivision plans and site plan approval, should be included in the development code, while design and construction details should be located in the EDSPM. For example, street spacing and widths should be included in the SDC, but construction details about compaction and base layers for the roadway would be located in the EDSPM.
 - Many infrastructure development requirements affect residential development and should have a clear and objective development option. There can still be a role for engineering discretion or analysis, however, provided it is through an alternative review path. For example, a clear and objective spacing requirement for block length could cap block length at 600 feet, while allowing an alternative length to be approved based on topography, natural resources, or other factors through an adjustment or similar process, similar to the existing standards in Section 4.2-115.
 - Some regulatory requirements are driven by state and federal standards, such as stormwater, and may change more quickly than the development code is updated. Where possible, reference outside standards rather than integrating into the development standards.

Site Development Standards (Sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

- *Landscaping (4.4-100)*: No specific concerns noted as applied to residential development; the exception to the landscaping standards for single-family residential and duplexes in Section 4.4-105.E could be clearer about which particular standards are exempted.
- *Lighting (4.5-100)*: No specific concerns noted as applied to residential development; single-family and duplex residential is exempt from these standards.
- *Off-street Parking (4.6-100)*:
 - The minimum off-street parking spaces required in Section 4.6-125 range from .75 to 2 spaces per residential unit. The requirement for multi-family is 1.5 spaces per unit is fairly standard, but can be a barrier to development by requiring that a large portion of the site be devoted to parking.
 - The requirement for 4-5 unit multifamily projects, quads and quints, to provide 0.75

spaces per bedroom, rather than per unit, could offer opportunities to reduce off-street parking for these smaller, presumably infill projects, but the per bedroom measurement is inconsistent with how parking is assessed for other residential uses. The rationale for limiting this standard to quads and quints, and excluding triplexes, is not clear.

- Standards include credits to reduce off-street parking for additional bicycle parking facilities (Section 4.6-120.I) and for on-street parking spaces (Section 4.6-110.F). The credit for parking reductions for residential uses in mixed-use development for sites located near transit in Section 4.6-125.G.3 could be clarified to include the exact reductions that can be earned, rather than defaulting to the Director's discretion; it could also be expanded to apply to all multifamily development and not only mixed-use. Generally, the parking credits could be combined in a single location for ease of use.
- Multifamily bicycle parking standard of one long-term space per dwelling unit in Section 4.6-155 appears reasonable, with provisions for spaces to be located in garages or storage units in Section 4.6-150.A.6.

Specific Development Standards (Section 4.7)

- *Duplexes (4.7-140)*: Corner lot limitation for duplexes applies in all residential zones; while this may have a policy purpose in the LDR zone, there may be additional opportunities for mid-block duplexes in other zones. The provisions for duplex partitioning in Section D appear to provide an opportunity for separate ownership, but the intent and logistics, including minimum and maximum lot sizes and the feasibility of retrofitting existing duplexes to provide fire separation and separate utilities, are not entirely clear.
- *Duplex and Attached Residential Design Standards (4.7-142)*: Generally, the design menu approach offers a clear and objective method for design standards. The majority of these standards lack definitions and minimum dimensions, which could create uncertainty or lead to undesirable design outcomes, such as inclusion of a single brick or tile to satisfy the materials variation item in Section B.13 rather than a significant portion of the façade. Additionally, the language in Section B that features should be "appropriate for the proposed building type and style," is discretionary and adds little regulatory specificity.
- *Mixed-Use Districts (4.7-180)*: These standards do not appear to include any additional provisions affecting residential uses in mixed-use districts.
- *Residential Uses in Commercial Districts (4.7-210)*: See discussion above with Commercial Districts.
- *Small Lot Residential District Development Standards (4.7-233)*: Requirement for variety of housing types appears clear and objective, though the lack of required percentages could mean that a development meets the standards by providing only a single unit of a different housing type.

Development Review Process (Chapter 5)

- *Pre-Development Meetings (5.1-120)*: Pre-submittal meetings, required in advance of site plan review and subdivision applications, intend to support early dialogue about development projects to improve development efficiencies and avoid last-minute design problems and expensive revisions. However, the balance between upfront investment in developing detailed plans for the pre-submittal and costs of addressing issues later in the process could continue to be explored. There may be opportunities to reduce barriers to development by streamlining application requirements for pre-submittal meetings, or using other tools like development issues meetings to review ideas at a more conceptual level prior to investing time in developing plans.
- *Accessory Dwelling Units (5.5-100)*:

- The requirements for two accessory dwelling units on medium-sized lots in the MDR and HDR zones, and the prohibition on ADUs for larger lots in those zones presumably is intended to meet the minimum density standards for those zones. However, the restrictions may not meet the requirements of SB 1051 requiring ADUs to be permitted with all detached single-family dwellings in residential zones, as is the case in the MDR and HDR zones, and these restrictions may not be “reasonable” siting and design standards.
- The standards avoid several “poison pill” restrictions that should remove barriers to development; notably they allow a Type I review, do not require owner occupancy, and have a variety of ways to meet the parking requirement that could include on-street parking. The standards could be further strengthened to support ADU development by removing the parking requirement entirely.
- The design options in Section 5.5-130 include a clear and objective option, which appears reasonable. The exterior wall offset requirement in Section B.6 is unusual, and may not be commonly applied based on the typically small scale of ADUs.
- While these standards do address the applicable review process and are organized with the review standards, the majority are development standards for ADUs that could be better located in Section 4.7 or even the residential zone standards in Section 3.2.
- *Land Division (5.12-100)*: Because land division is required to create lots for residential development, a clear and objective review path must be available. The most significant issue in this section is the approval criteria for tentative plat in Section 5.12-125, which could be improved for greater clarity and effective review of proposed projects.
 - *Criteria A*: No concerns about requirement to meet minimum lot sizes and dimensions. Conformance with density standards should also be required.
 - *Criteria B*: Requirement for zoning to conform with applicable plans does not seem useful; zoning conformity should be addressed through a separate map amendment process prior to land division.
 - *Criteria C*: Requirement for adequate infrastructure capacity to serve the development, as determined by the Public Works Director, is an inherently discretionary criterion. Consider replacing with references to specific infrastructure capacity standards.
 - *Criteria D*: Requirement for compliance with design and construction standards could be improved through a more detailed list of applicable standards elsewhere in code and outside of code; additional review of said standards should also evaluate whether improvement requirements themselves are clear and objectives.
 - *Criteria E*: Requirement to protect significant natural features could benefit from greater clarity. While some features reference specific code sections or ORS citations, other features that do not appear to be defined in the code, such as “significant clusters of trees” and “rock outcroppings.” Greater clarity is needed on the specific features protected and which code standards must be met.
 - *Criteria F*: All of circulation standards in this criterion could benefit from additional clarification, either here in the criteria or through references to traffic and circulation standards elsewhere in the code. For example, the requirement to “facilitate vehicular traffic, bicycle and pedestrian safety to avoid congestion,” does not clearly define “congestion” and would be better served by a reference to adopted level-of-service standards or similar objective standards.
 - *Criteria G*: Criterion to allow development of the remainder of the property would benefit from additional clarification about specific goals and standards at issue.
 - *Criteria H*: Criterion to allow development of adjacent properties, including providing

- adequate access, would benefit from additional clarification about specific goals and standards at issue.
- *Criteria I:* No significant concerns about the requirement for subdivisions within the urbanizable fringe outside city limits. Potential to cross-reference standards for the Urbanizable Fringe Overlay District in Section 3.3-800.
 - *Criteria J:* No significant concerns about standards for manufactured dwelling park subdivisions, though additional discussion around the needs of existing parks would be helpful to understand any potential barriers to development.
 - *Site Plan Review (5.17-100):* Because Site Plan Review is required for all multi-family development in residential, commercial and mixed-use districts, a clear and objective review path must be available. There are several concerns about the existing process.
 - *Review (5.17-110):* In line with comments to consider a Type I review process for multi-family development electing to meet strictly clear and objective standards in Section 3.2-240.C, the current requirement in Section 5.17-110.B for a Type II could be expanded to allow a Type I review. Provided that standards are clear and objective, no discretion triggering a Type II review would be applied.
 - *Submittal Requirements (5.17-120):* The application requirements for site plan review include multiple specialized plans that must be prepared by professionals, including lighting, landscaping and stormwater plans, which is typical of the development review process in Springfield and elsewhere. There may be opportunities to reduce barriers to development by aligning the level of detail in these materials with the level required to determine compliance with standards.
 - *Approval criteria (5.17-125):* The approval criteria cause the most significant concerns about the opportunity for clear and objective review of residential projects, because they incorporate significant discretion. Note that many overlap with the tentative plat approval criteria.
 - *Criteria A:* Requirement for zoning to conform with applicable plans does not seem useful; zoning conformity should be addressed through a separate map amendment process prior to land division.
 - *Criteria B:* Requirement for adequate infrastructure capacity to serve the development, as determined by the Public Works Director, is an inherently discretionary criterion. Consider replacing with references to specific infrastructure capacity standards.
 - *Criteria C:* Requirement for compliance with design and construction standards could be improved through a more detailed list of applicable standards elsewhere in code and outside of code; additional review of said standards should also evaluate whether improvement requirements themselves are clear and objectives.
 - *Criteria D:* All of circulation standards in this criterion could benefit from additional clarification, either here in the criteria or through references to traffic and circulation standards elsewhere in the code.
 - *Criteria E:* Requirement to protect significant natural features could benefit from greater clarity. While some features reference specific code sections or ORS citations, other features that do not appear to be defined in the code, such as "significant clusters of trees" and "rock outcroppings." Greater clarity is needed on the specific features protected and which code standards must be met.
 - *Conditions (5.17-130):* This section includes a lengthy list of discretionary requirements, seemingly over and above the standards elsewhere in the code. For example, the

blanket requirement for a sight-obscuring fence and/or vegetative screen to address a "land use conflict" as determined by the Director could be addressed through clear and objective screening requirements between zoning districts or for specific use types where conflicts could be anticipated. There is an attempt to avoid conflicts with the clear and objective standards requirement by stating, "Conditions imposed to satisfy the Site Plan application approval criteria shall not be used to exclude "needed housing" as defined in OAR 660-08-015," but the language does not entirely exempt residential projects from compliance with this section, or define when the conditions cross into excluding residential projects.