

**Date** 15 October 2015

**Project** Springfield Downtown and Public Realm Design Standards | Task 2.5

**To** Downtown Citizen Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee

**Copy** Linda Pauly, City of Springfield; Laura Buhl, Transportation Growth Management

**From** Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks, Inc.

## Springfield Downtown and Public Realm Design Standards | Task 2.5

### Brief Description of the Project

The primary documents under review by the TAG and CAC during this phase of the project are draft development standards for 1) new development on private property, and 2) the public streets and sidewalks. These documents are called:

- 1) Downtown Development Standards, Draft 1
- 2) Downtown District Streetscape Standards, Draft 1

Pages 6 and 7 of this document includes an excerpt from the consultant's Scope of Work that lists the items to be addressed by each document.

As revisions to the City of Springfield's Development Code and Engineering Design Standards, these draft documents are quite detailed. To focus CAC and TAG review and provide an overview of the documents, Urbsworks has prepared the following two tables. The tables are intended to highlight particular issues that need attention and guide CAC and TAG discussion.

### Acronyms used in this document

**MUC** Mixed Use Commercial

**TSP** Transportation System Plan

**ODOT** Oregon Department of Transportation

**STA** Special Transportation Area

**EDSPM or EDSP** Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual

**DDUDP** Downtown District Urban Design Plan and Implementation Strategy

**ITE** Institute of Transportation Engineers

## Reviewer’s Guide to Downtown Development Standards, Draft 1

### Introduction

There are multiple overlapping base zones and overlay districts that apply to the downtown. Besides being difficult to understand and administer, they may not produce buildings that have the desired shape, size and orientation, consistent with the DDUDP and other city goals.

The purpose of the new Downtown Development Standards is to provide, all in one place, clear and objective standards for building form, site design and open space character. The emphasis of the new standards is the shape of buildings and how they frame streets and alleys, and there is greater emphasis on the design of the ground floor of buildings, particularly on Main Street.

The proposed “Regulating Plan will show where different design standards such as building height, etc.) may desired to achieve what is most important in downtown. Therefore the proposed code places more emphasis on the buildings facing the proposed open spaces, Main Street and the Washburne Historic Neighborhood edge.

Topic	Recommendation background and rationale	TAG and CAC discussion points
Regulating Plan	We recommend the establishment of a map graphic to show Downtown subareas or streets where particular design standards will apply. This is similar to a zoning map, except that it emphasizes development standards and focuses regulation on the shape, size and orientation of buildings. Unlike a zoning map, a regulating plan is less concerned with which land uses are permitted where. The Regulating Plan maps the location and applicability of all Downtown Development Standards.	Discuss the purpose of the Regulating Plan.
Development Standards	<p>While land uses will not change, we recommend that the new Downtown Development Standards simplify and consolidate the various overlapping and sometimes conflicting development standards and organize them by subarea and by street as recommended in the DDUDP and DDUDP Appendix.</p> <p>The MUC zone promotes generally more urban form than other zones that currently apply to the downtown. Therefore, the proposed development standards largely extend those included in the MUC, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum density: 16 dwelling units / acre, net</li> <li>• Minimum Lot / Parcel Size: 6,000 sq ft in Downtown Urban zone; 2,500 sq ft in Downtown General</li> </ul>	Discuss the development standards of the various overlapping zones and those of the MUC in particular.
Development Standards Zones	Two subareas are proposed for the Downtown: Downtown Urban Zone and Downtown General Zone. The Downtown Urban Zone is more intense and urban, requiring greater number of stories and height, for example, than Downtown General. Downtown Urban applies to many of	Discuss the development standards that apply to the two subareas and to Main Street. Are the two proposed subareas appropriate, or are additional subareas needed? What should the subareas be named? Do

Topic	Recommendation background and rationale	TAG and CAC discussion points
	<p>the same areas that the DDUDP identified for greater land use and urban form intensity, around the proposed open spaces of Mill Plaza and Post Office Park (See DDUDP Appendix, page 17).</p> <p>In addition to the two zones, all lots facing the Main Street are subject to additional standards.</p>	<p>other streets besides Main Street deserve special design standards?</p>
Land uses	<p>We propose that the current land uses remain in place, and that a simplified table be created with general categories for uses, based on those permitted in the MUC.</p>	<p>Discuss possible inclusion of a simplified land use table that would apply to the Downtown.</p>
Building form	<p>Proposed stepbacks apply to the perimeter of block, where buildings face the streets, and not on alleys.</p>	<p>Discuss pros and cons of requiring stepbacks in general and whether should apply to alley frontages.</p>

## Reviewer’s Guide to Downtown District Streetscape Standards, Draft 1

### Introduction

One of the most important features of downtown streets is the sidewalk, and to some extent, the parking space, particularly when it is treated as an extension of the sidewalk zone, through sidewalk extensions, parklets and bike parking. The draft document defines the five zones of the sidewalk, what types of treatments are appropriate for each zone, and the various treatment options. When combined, sidewalk and street treatments create or reinforce a theme or personality. A major focus of CAC and TAG review at this meeting will be the treatments of the sidewalk and how they should differ or be the same from street to street. Therefore the document starts on page 10, with sidewalks. Pages 1-9, in the final draft, will contain the Street Typology. CAC and TAG input received on the on the sidewalk details will inform the Street Typology.

The purpose of the new Downtown District Streetscape Standards is to provide, all in one place, clear and objective standards for street design, from building edge to building edge. While the TSP and other documents, including those from ODOT, provide standards, many of those are not appropriate for the downtown. Therefore, the proposed draft code represents not only a gathering up of and reorganization of existing standards, but also set of entirely new standards. Some of the most important new standards that need to be discussed are speed of vehicular traffic, curb radius standards and freight route designation.

Topic	Recommendation background and rationale	TAG and CAC discussion points
Sidewalk width	<p>The recommended sidewalk width is 12 feet, minimum. Where possible, wider sidewalks should be considered. Benefits include more generous space for pedestrians and commerce, and narrower vehicular travel lanes, which help reduce speeds. Most streets in the downtown are existing, and wider sidewalks would require relocation of curbs and reconstruction. Streets that are undergoing other improvements, for the incorporation of dedicated transit, or stormwater management facilities, for example, may be candidates for wider sidewalks. There are also other ways to narrow the vehicular travel lane and extend the sidewalk zone, without reconstruction, through the use of paint, or through the re-designation of street space, such as parklets.</p>	<p>Discuss sidewalk widths, zones and the benefits of wider sidewalks. Discuss where and when wider sidewalks might be implemented. Discuss other ways to reallocate street space for greater pedestrian comfort.</p>
Speed of vehicular traffic	<p>There are multiple, interrelated city, regional and state policy and engineering standards that apply to Downtown Springfield streets. Minimum Design Speed for motor vehicles is set by the EDSP, according to Functional Classification. The EDSP states exceptions for Nodal Overlay zones and business districts with high pedestrian activity. Functional Classification is set by the TSP. The speeds for downtown streets vary by street classification and zoning. Minimum Design Speeds for the four sample streets are as follows: Main Street and South A (Minor Arterial and Arterial, respectively), 35-50 mph; 5th Street (Collector), 25 mph, and 8th Street (Local), 20 mph.</p> <p>In the TSP Main Street is listed as an Arterial, and according to the EDSPM, minimum design speed for Arterials is 35 MPH. However, Main Street between Mill and 10th is also an ODOT STA, and as such, new standards may change the applicable ODOT design standards,</p>	<p>Speeds of 35 mph are not acceptable for a robust pedestrian area like Downtown. Effective speeds should be between 12 and 18 mph.</p>

Topic	Recommendation background and rationale	TAG and CAC discussion points
	<p>mobility standards and access management spacing standards within the segment.</p> <p>We recommend that the new Downtown District Streetscape Chapter define downtown-specific street standards. The STA designation, as well as policies which came later, such as the DDUDP Livability Streets and the TSP Toolbox measures, enable this project to establish a new type of arterial street for the downtown, in which speeds are slower.</p> <p>Additionally, we recommend that the new standards promote the concept of Target Speed instead of Design Speed, and refer to the ITE Recommended Practice: “Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach.” Target Speed is achieved through a combination of signal timing, narrower travel lanes, curb extensions and medians, eliminating horizontal offsets and superelevation, smaller curb radii and other urban street design features.</p> <p>Finally, we recommend that design features specified in the Downtown District Streetscape Chapter aim for a Downtown-wide Target Speed of less than 20 mph.</p>	
<p>Curb radius and freight route</p>	<p>Main Street is a designated truck route, as is South A and some other streets within the downtown. For streets designated as truck routes, ODOT and the EDSPM requires corners radius to accommodate a large truck turning, which can limit the design treatments we may want for pedestrian comfort and safety, such curb extensions that shorten crossing distance at intersections.</p> <p>We recommend that new standards promote the concept of analytical approach in the selection of a design vehicle and refer to the ITE Recommended Practice: Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach: “In urban areas it is not always practical or desirable to use the largest design vehicle that might occasionally use the facility, because the impacts to pedestrians crossing distances, speed of turning vehicles and so forth may be inconsistent with the community vision and goals and objectives for the thoroughfare.”</p> <p>Consistent with feedback received at the TAG Meeting on June 25, 2015, the fact that downtown streets are one-way are an advantage in this case, and since wide-turning trucks will not be limited to the nearest lane for turning, but may use the entire street if necessary, allowing for a smaller, pedestrian-friendly turning radius.</p> <p>We recommend that the new Downtown District Streetscape Chapter use 15-foot curb radius, and use curb extensions to provide an effectively wider turning radius where necessary. A 15-foot curb radius is what is suggested for local-to-local street turns in nonresidential areas with a design vehicle of single-unit truck or emergency vehicle.</p>	<p>Discuss the benefits of tighter curb radii. Where might we be able to standardize tighter turning radius while accommodating trucks, and which locations should be highest priority for such standards.</p>

## Description of the Work Products

(from the Scope of Work)

### Work Product I - New Adoption-ready Downtown District Streetscape Chapter for the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures- Manual

The chapter must include standards for the items listed below. Standards for c) through l) will include location and placement requirements, minimum standards (e.g., minimum clear width for alleys), and a menu of illustrated design options. The standards must be organized by street type.

- a) Designs for typical cross sections for four different street classifications within the Downtown Refinement Plan area, with sidewalk zones, parking, travel lanes, and bike facilities (including option for protected bikeways):
  - 1) Highway couplet, traditional downtown (e.g., Main Street)
  - 2) Highway couplet, other (e.g., South A)
  - 3) Two local, or side, streets
- b) Typical Streetscape concept schematic design for each street cross section from item a). (plan view)
- c) Private cafe seating on public sidewalks
- d) Pedestrian-friendly and Americans with Disabilities Act compliant intersection treatments, including curb extensions/bulb-outs, raised intersections, curb radii, and decorative paving materials
- e) General location, design, and conditions for installation (i.e., standards for establishing when planters may be installed) of stormwater planters and other planted areas in the streetscape
- f) Paving materials and treatments for future sidewalk replacement and new improvements (including update of the current exposed aggregate standard)
- g) Placement for way-finding signage (in consultation with the Oregon Department of Transportation)
- h) Street tree placement, including addressing flexibility for vision clearance triangles, lighting, spacing, species, tree-well requirements, and any other necessary elements
- i) Streetscape furniture, including type, color, finish, material, location, and installation requirements, for benches, planters, trash receptacles, bollards, bike racks, etc.
- j) On-street bike parking corrals and on-street parklets
- k) Development and use of alleys, including, but not limited to, drainage, clearance, appearance, pavement quality, loading, back-of-store activities, and pedestrian accessibility
- l) Public art, general locations, and appropriate placement

Work Product 2 - New Adoption-ready Downtown District Chapter for the Springfield Development Code

The chapter must synthesize existing code requirements into a new hybrid form-based code with approximately 1/3 graphics, 1/3 text, 1/3 tables and must include standards for the items listed below. The standards may be organized by street type in order to coordinate with Work Product 1.

- a) Building heights
- b) Building setbacks/build to lines
- c) Building façade articulation
- d) Building transparency/"active edges" (following best practices for retail district design)
- e) Building orientation/entrances
- f) Exterior building and sign illumination
- g) Weather protection
- h) Bike parking
- i) Plazas and public spaces (using evidence-based urban design standards to create public spaces that get used)
- j) Parking lot, parking structure design, and loading (considering recommendations from the 2010 Downtown Parking Plan)
- k) Screening of mechanical equipment
- l) Improved interface between Downtown and the adjacent Washburne Historic District, a residential neighborhood north of downtown
- m) Pedestrian orientation of signs
- n) Other existing development standards applicable in Downtown District

Work Product 3 - Downtown District Design Standards Guide

Combine and format Work Products 1 and 2 into one stand-alone document that combines all applicable downtown design standards into a user-friendly, color-illustrated Downtown District Design Standards Guide.