

City of Springfield
Regular Meeting

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION HELD
Tuesday, March 20, 2018

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in a regular session in the City Council Chambers, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Tuesday, March 20, 2018 at 7:00 p.m., with Commissioner James presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Chair James, Vice Chair Koivula, Commissioners James, Nelson, Vohs, Dunn and Landen. Also present were, Current Development Manager Greg Mott, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith and Management Specialist Brenda Jones; Molly Markarian Senior Planner; and members of the staff.

ABSENT

Commissioner Sherwood- Excused

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Greg James

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

Read by City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith

CRITERIA OF APPROVAL

Read by Greg Mott

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Greg James: Any adjustments to the agenda tonight? Hearing none: This is our time that we have an opportunity to take input and testimony from the audience. I would just tell you that we are moving into a Legislative Public Hearing later during our session tonight, specifically related to relocating the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual into the Springfield Development Code. Testimony related to that specific topic will be entertained during our Legislative Session.

If you wish to address the board on other Glenwood issues or topics, you're welcome to do that now. I have two requests. I'm assuming these requests are related to the public hearing, is that correct? Yes? Okay.

That being said, we'll move forward. We have the approval of our January 23rd Joint Work Session minutes and Joint Regular Session minutes. Do I hear a move, a motion, to approve those minutes?

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Tim Vohs: I move to approve the minutes of the Joint Meeting with Lane County for January 23, 2018; the Work Session minutes; and the Regular Meeting minutes.

Mike Koivula: As amended? I sent some amendments, corrections.

Tim Vohs: As amended.

Greg James: As amended, do we have a second?

Mike Koivula: Second.

Greg James: Motion to approve the Work Session minutes of January 23rd and the Regular Meeting minutes of January 23rd, as amended, was moved by Commissioner Vohs and seconded by Commissioner Koivula. All those in favor, say your part by saying, "Aye."

All: Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING

1. RELOCATE GLENWOOD RIVERFRONT STREET DESIGN STANDARDS FROM ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES MANUAL (EDSPM) TO THE SPRINGFIELD DEVELOPMENT CODE

Greg James: Vohs' motion carries. At this time, we will conduct a Legislative Public Hearing to relocate the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, EDSPM, to the Springfield Development Code, 811-17-000137-TYP4. This is a Legislative Public Hearing, so I don't think I need turn it over to the Legal Counsel; I'll just turn it over to our senior planner, Molly.

STAFF REPORT

Molly Markarian: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm presenting the Staff Report for Case Number 811-17-000137, proposing to move the text and images from Appendix 1A of the EDSPM, Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, to the Springfield Development Code by Council Ordinance. A copy of the Staff Report is found in Attachment 2 of your packet. As some of you will recall, following an extensive four-year process, the City adopted a package of Land Use Amendments to the Metro Plan, Glenwood Refinement Plan, Springfield Development Code, and Springfield Zoning Map, in 2012, for the Glenwood Riverfront, or the Phase 1 area of Glenwood, as part of a comprehensive effort directed by the City Council to update the Glenwood Refinement Plan. To support implementation of the Glenwood Refinement Plan's infrastructure policies, the City also adopted specific design standards for the internal street network in 2012, as well.

These Glenwood specific street standards were adopted by Resolution into the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, as was customary at that time. Based on the recommendation of the City Attorney's office, the City is currently in the process of moving all design standards that implement Comprehensive Plan policies into the Development Code.

At this time, we propose moving the Glenwood Street Standards, currently comprising Appendix 1A of the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual, to the Development Code as outlined in Attachment 3 of your packet. In accordance with the Oregon Administrative Rules, staff submitted notice of the proposed amendment to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on February 13th. Additionally, in accordance with the Springfield Development Code and with the Citizen Engagement Plan approved by Springfield's Committee for Citizen Engagement for this project, notice of this Public Hearing was published in the *Register Guard* on February 28th. Notice of this Hearing and responses to Frequently Asked Questions were mailed to all property owners and residents in the Glenwood Riverfront area. All owners and residents were also invited to a general Glenwood Open House on March 13th.

In response to Public Notice, I received four emails and three phone calls; the written contents of which I've placed into the record and which you have in front of you. In all instances, comments, questions or concerns, are related to the possible impact of the proposed amendments on the individuals. As I explained to those property owners and residents, the action before you will have no material impact on them, as the standards were adopted in 2012, and we are thus proposing to merely relocate them from the Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual to the Development

Code. Furthermore, the standards guide street improvements at the time of development or redevelopment. In addition to clarifications regarding the proposal before you, questions and comments were also submitted regarding streets south of Franklin Boulevard, sewer availability, permitted uses and the Franklin Boulevard construction project. Additionally, questions were posed regarding the possible future of manufactured home park development and concerns about the impact of the implementation of the Glenwood Refinement Plan policies on very low-income residents. While not the subject of what is before you, I would like to note that this topic was explored in depth at the time the Phase 1 Glenwood Refinement Plan was originally adopted and through the subsequent appeal, LUBA remand, revisions, and re-adoptions of the Glenwood Refinement Plan and its ultimate acknowledgement by the Department of Land Conservation and Development in 2014. The City subsequently took a leadership role in convening Local, State, and Federal partners in developing a coordinated housing and social services assistance response to vulnerable populations in manufactured home parks. The outcome of that effort is a tool kit for communities to inventory, assess, and support manufactured home parks at risk of closure. In 2016, the City Council also directed staff to evaluate housing needs and to build on existing strategies to increase the supply of housing and accessibility of affordable housing in Springfield.

In summary, as stated in Springfield Development Code section 5.6-115A, the criteria of approval for amendments to the Development Code are conformance with the Metro Plan, applicable State statutes, and applicable statewide planning goals and administrative regulations. As outlined on pages 3 to 10 of the Staff Report, staff finds the subject code amendment to be consistent with this criteria. Staff, therefore, requests that the Springfield Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Springfield City Council regarding the proposed amendments to Springfield Development Code section 3.4-200.

Greg James: Any questions for Molly at this time?

Tim Vohs: In your original report, you indicated or it was stated, that concluding this process of moving the Glenwood language from the Procedure Manual to the Development Code, that there will be additional steps forward. What are those additional steps?

Molly Markarian: I am not sure I understand.

Tim Vohs: I can summarize quickly, it's saying that the Glenwood Standards Amendment is the first in a series of amendments of transferring from the manual to the Code.

Molly Markarian: I believe that you have the transportation, TSP implementation policies, the downtown policies, and I don't know if there's--

Mary Bridget Smith: There will be some current standards that are in the Engineering Design Manual that will be moved to the Development Code. Some of those relate to transportation and other ones to Downtown.

Tim Vohs: Okay, thank you.

Greg James: At this time, we will take public input.

TESTIMONY FROM THOSE IN SUPPORT

Greg James: First, testimonies in support of the proposal. Hearing none, I have one marked neutral, and against the proposal and one not marked and one against the proposal.

TESTIMONY OF THOSE OPPOSED

Martin Desmond: Good evening Springfield Planning Commission and members. My name is Martin Desmond. I live at 4531 Franklin Boulevard, Space 119. That's in the Glenwood area of Springfield. I drafted a letter, and Molly said that you would be provided a copy of it. I'll touch on a couple of highlights in the letter. I realize in one sense, this is just sort of a fairly bureaucratic move today as you're moving language from the Procedure Manual into the Code.

My spouse and I have lived in the Glenwood area for about three and a half years. We previously lived in the Thurston neighborhood for 15 years. I had the opportunity to read through parts of Glenwood Refinement Plan in the last day or two, I'll confess, it's the first time I ever read it.

I'm really concerned about a lot of the language in there, particularly the direction. And it ties into these road standards. I know the Planning Commission members will probably disagree with me, but what I see is an attempt by the City of Springfield to gentrify the Glenwood area. Because I live here now, I'll be the first one, as I put in my letter, to say that Glenwood area is an ugly wart but it serves a very useful function. There are many thousands of people that live in mobile homes, travel trailers, RVs. There really is not a place for these people, or few other options for a number of these people to have. So I'm quite concerned about both the general direction of the Refinement Plan and in one sense, from what I can understand, most of it is related to what is referred to as the Franklin Riverfront Area, where we live, which is referred to as the McVay area. Apparently, there's not as much planning done for that. Until I feel that we really have a commitment from Springfield City Council to protect and preserve mobile home parks in this area, I would ask that you actually delete the language at 3.4-270, A through F, where you address the McVay Highway. That concludes my testimony, and I appreciate it.

Greg James: Thank you. Next, I have Vicky McGowan.

Greg James: Vicky, state your name and your address, please.

Vicky McGowan: Yes, I would like to say good evening to all the Planning Commissioners and members.

Greg James: Name and address for the record, please.

Vicky McGowan: Vicky McGowan 4531 Franklin Blvd #119.

Greg James: Thank you.

Victoria McGowan: I have written a letter, and I believe you've all received a copy, so I'm going to try to summarize this and stay within my three-minute timeframe. I, too, am somewhat remiss in reading all 167-plus pages and will try to do so more thoroughly. I have looked at it several times throughout the course of the years, and I have been in contact with Molly over the course of the years as well, so this is not the first time I've had concern.

I was looking in particular at this letter written on January 30th, 2013, where the petitioner, Shamrock Homes, were talking in that letter that the whole intent of that letter was the City's decision to wipe out several hundred units of affordable housing, including 11 acres of the Shamrock property as most grievous. There's mention of a Metro Plan Housing Policy 825 that says to conserve this kind of housing. I'm also making a reference to ORS 197.307, which actually addresses the effect of need for certain housing in urban growth areas. Having lived in the park for three and a half years, I would say that I have been really struck by the number of wonderful people and seniors who've lived there. Some of them have lived there for over 20, 30 years. Some of them are really shaken up by all of this. They're expressing real fear and concerns for where they're going to go. Some of them couldn't even make it to this meeting; they're just too fragile, frail, or too old or sick, or whatever, so I'm also speaking out for those. Our home isn't too old; it was built in the '90s. It's a manufactured home, double-wide, but there's a lot of people that live in single-wides. Some of those homes are pretty precarious. They were built in the '60s, I think, or older. To be given some money to move those, One, the house would probably break down while they are moving. Second, where are they going to move them to? I don't think there's too many affordable senior home parks for these people to move to, should something ever happen, a rich developer come in and take over the park. That's my concern. In the future, where are these folks going to go to? Low-cost residents are

people too, same concerns, same dreams, and desires as any of our affluent members of our community, and they need to be taken more seriously by answering their concerns in how they can continue to live; not just in the next year or so but continue to live in affordable housing in the future.

I also concur with Mr. Martin Desmond that the manufactured home parks and such, that these do provide some real affordable living situation where people can afford and live reasonably okay. There are a lot of creative ways to get rid of the ugly eyesores that our parks may create. Some of that could be that the City could maybe, provide some monies to go into that to help improve the looks of some of those, especially on the outside. I'm sure you all are aware of what the Shamrock Park looks like on the outside but anyway, also monies to help people who are living in shacks and to help them fix up their places. Anyway, I appreciate your time.

Greg James: Thank you so much. The last request that we have is neither in favor or against, is from Alberto Miranda.

Greg James: Please step forward and address the commission, if you would, Mr. Miranda.

Alberto Miranda: Thank you. My name is Alberto Miranda. I'm from Costa Rica. I have been in Oregon for 39 years. My business, Cafeto, has been in the Glenwood area for 28 years. Do you need my home address for the record?

Greg James: Yes, you can state it for the record.

Alberto Miranda: My business address is 4000 East 22nd.

20 years ago, we built this facility. I really don't avoid any of the planning issues. We have been able to observe all of the specs and regulations. The City of Eugene at the time, because we were under their planning jurisdiction, requested from us and we built our facility that now provides 24 full-time positions and about six part-time positions. Cafeto has been in business for 35 years. We started here on Centennial in 1984, had a very short couple of years on Shelley Street, and eventually moved to Judkins Road where we began to plan the development of our site.

We are, in this moment, confronting a very aggressive move by the Springfield Utility Board to take our land away from us for the purpose of building a transmission line that is leading to their substation across the street from our building. That happens to be a wetland, the only Palustrine wetland in all of Glenwood. In the process to build this substation on the wetland, they will destroy a tremendous amount of trees, about 300 of them. That is the last stand we have in Glenwood of woods of reasonable size that are currently doing the job that needs to be done, not only aesthetically but functionally, also. This environmental insult is in the works, and we came over to respectfully request the mediation of the Planning Commission for these issues. The problem that we have here is that there is a very competitive feeding frenzy between the two utilities, Eugene Water and Electric Board with over 20 acres adjacent to our property and Springfield Utility Board with 10 acres adjacent to our property.

Our property became an island; we have publicly owned property surrounding us. We need to find a way to stop this aggressive, invasive utility format and force the two utility companies to come to term with each other, choose a site, and take care of business. As it is right now, EWEB ran out of reasons to build in the McCauley property, which is the 24-acre property, and now the land is an idle there. We do have very complex demographics there. There is some camps currently on that property. SUB is in the works to see if they could build their substation there. We need to find a way to provide the spaces for these two entities to give us their needs and a way to resolve them without wrecking a 35-year effort that our company has been making to establish a viable business, a sustainable business, in this community.

With all due respect, I request your mediation to address this very serious planning issue that is currently under this jurisdiction. We would like to see if any of you could relate to my concerns right now. Is there a plan? This is going to all of you. Do you know of a plan that the City has to develop that entire area between the railroad track and I-5 on East 22nd? Is there an underlying plan in the works or is this just the result of improvisation and competition between the two utility companies? What do we have here that could make my business retain the property and the community retain the jobs and the next site that we have already projected?

Greg James: I hear what you're saying. I don't know that it's related to this specific Public Hearing. I certainly will relate, ask staff, post your testimony. As we get into deliberations and talk, we may be able to get some direction from staff and find out more, but let us get a little further in the process. We've taken your comments now. I don't have an answer for you, but I certainly will request the information from staff about that specific topic. Okay?

Alberto Miranda: Okay, thank you.

Greg James: Certainly.

Gay Anne Brinda: Excuse me. May I respectfully ask to submit a late one?

Greg James: Yes, you may. State your name and address, please.

Gay Anne Brinda: My name is Gay Anne Brinda I'm at the Shamrock Mobile Home in RV Park, 4531 Franklin Boulevard number 89, and I'm still really new to the area. I moved here because I'm on disability right now, and actually, it's very affordable for me right now. I think we've done a lot to start improving the cosmetics of Shamrock. The owners have done a lot, as far as updating and bringing up to code certain electrical issues and such.

Our previous managers didn't really stay current. I don't think it's an ugly little wart; I think it's a neighborhood that's not being gentrified necessarily, but it's definitely going through a facelift without white teeth. My biggest concern is the environment. There were some residents that were just stupid, cut down trees. The owner has had trees replanted there. I thought 35 feet, that's what the last manager, two managers ago, told me. It was 35 feet from the river for this bike path. Okay, 75 feet is going to wipe out a lot. Now looking over this plan here, I'm seeing all the parking that's just on the west side of the little bridges, and I'm wondering if what you have in mind isn't a little bit more like Denver, Colorado where you have a river and there is just no real natural life there at all. You've got concrete down the river on either side, and buildings. I'm a Portland girl, so I'm used to having a forest park there with all the eagles flying overhead. I was just telling my friend I saw like nine eagles just over the river, then two behind me, that would be on the other side of Franklin over there to the southwest, and that's going to go away. With all that pollution, they are going to go away. They are going to find other places to be. We have deer that cross the river, and I know that's very enjoyable. People raft. The first year I was there, which was July, 2015, the only eagle I saw swooped to like for a hundred yards up the river, and there were these college kids rafting. It was just totally unafraid and having a jolly, good time, and we'll lose that.

I do not disagree with gentrification. I was in Northeast Portland when that was gentrified. We kept a lot of the older buildings, though. New things happened along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, nice apartments, condominiums.

I see that is a lot of undeveloped ground, but I'm not really sure what you have. I heard something about college dorms, apartments, and all, but the pollution going up and down the river; we already get just tons and tons of grass seeds coming up because for some reason, that backs up. We have all this extra pollution in Springfield during the summer. I'm not sure how all that's going to work with all the extra car emissions. I looked at that proposal there; unfortunately, I did not have a chance to look online. You have mostly just disgusting parking; streets and parking; cars. Springfield is beautiful, I don't know if it's going to stay that way with all the cars. Okay, thanks.

Greg James: Okay. Thank you for the public testimony; certainly appreciate it.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Greg James: We have some question and answer time from the Commission. We had a couple of topics that were brought up. We had two or three discussing the Shamrock Property specifically. Molly, these road standards moving from where they are to the Code; those properties will not be developed until, if and when, either a developer purchases the properties or the people who own them currently choose to develop, is that correct? The Shamrock Property.

Molly Markarian: Yes. Correct.

Greg James: Are you aware of the piece of property that Mr. Miranda was discussing related to the SUB electrical station, and what's going on there?

Molly Markarian: I am aware that EWEB was looking to purchase property in the Phase II area of the Glenwood Refinement Plan, and that SUB was also looking to do that. I don't know what the status of those sales is. Phase II, when the council directed staff to update the Glenwood Refinement Plan, it was intended to be a phased project. The Riverfront was completed first, and we're waiting for Council direction to do Phase II at some point in the future. So that's when the Comprehensive Planning update would happen for that area.

Greg James: Phase II, really we do not have--?

Molly Markarian: We don't have a timeline or proposal.

Greg James: A timeline or a plan specifically for that?

Molly Markarian: Mr. Mott might be able to answer more to that and also as it relates to EWEB, SUB. Maybe there's a current development application in for the SUB property.

Greg Mott: SUB is interested in pursuing the development of a substation in Glenwood in the vicinity of the bakery, and it will tie into the power lines that go down to the substation near Goshen, or I guess in Goshen. It's a backup line, in case of failure of other systems, is not needed to-

Greg James: So, it's redundancy, basically.

Greg Mott: Yes, it is. It's not needed for industry right now. In the past, EWEB was interested in exercising a water right that they have, and constructing an inlet facility close to where Nugget Way is. They were going to pump the water from that inlet facility to the base of the hill that goes up towards I-5, and they were going to build a treatment plant there. Then, they were going to connect that treatment plant to lines they have real close to I-5 where Franklin goes and possibly underneath I-5 into the Laurel Hill area. They requested the Springfield City Council initiate the amendment to the PFSP and the Glenwood Refinement Plan to allow that to go forward. Our Council declined to initiate, so Eugene City Council could initiate this on their behalf. It's a regional issue, all three jurisdictions have to participate. I haven't heard what their plan is to do with that property.

Greg James: Would that come before the Planning Commission?

Greg Mott: Well, it depends on what they want to do with it. If they want to do that water facility, it has to come to the Planning Commission first then go to the Elected Officials. If they want to do something else with it, I don't know what that might be but if they're going to propose to do something else with it, whatever zone, if they have a proposal that is consistent with that zoning, then it would probably just be a Site Plan Review kind of an application. I'm not even sure it's in the city limits, whether they would have to annex or not, what kind of services are available to it, I don't know. We never got far enough along the way with that water treatment plant to find out any of that information. I'm not aware of any pitch battle between SUB and EWEB. They may be in close proximity. SUB's interests are 100% electric, and up to now, all I know is EWEB's interests are 100% water, so that's all I know.

Greg James: It sounds as if we're not aware of anything being in the works currently, and there will be other opportunities if there were something to take place, for public testimony, then put into process?

Greg Mott: Again, it really depends on the nature of what they want to do; some activities don't require a Public Hearing to go forward.

Sean Dunn: It was discussed before the City Council on September 19th of 2016. That's where the council decided that they didn't want to basically carry the thing forward and deferred it back to the EWEB folks to do something else with it.

Mike Koivula: But as far as I know, according to the report we get every week, the high-profile report, there hasn't been any action on that, no updates on that as far as I know.

Greg James: Commissioners, do you have questions related to the action before us from staff, yes?

Mike Koivula: I don't know if this is premature, but Mr. Miranda, who has a business there is there already a discussion or some sort of an action which will cause him to lose his property?

Greg James: That's what we were just discussing, and number one, it really does not apply to this specific action or undertaking, and I want to be sure our staff have an opportunity to put the information out that you are aware of. You've heard now what our Planning Manager has said, and our Senior Planner. I think that there could be something coming downstream. I would encourage Mr. Miranda to stay connected with the activities of both SUB and EWEB and the City Councils. Certainly, we have jurisdictions over anything that's a planning-related issue, and at a certain level, it would come before us, and we could be engaged in their processes.

Mike Koivula: Both EWEB and SUB have public meetings of all their commissioners, they certainly do.

Greg James: Those are public processes as well, so I'd encourage you to stay connected there.

The business at hand is related to relocating the Street Design Standards from the EDSPM to the Springfield Development Code. Do we have other questions? I certainly appreciate the input and the concerns voiced from the public in relation to the mobile home parks. I think that was discussed in great detail when we went through and put this plan together initially. This action, this evening, is really relocating what our current standards are into our Development Code. It's really required, isn't it, Legal Counsel? Has there been a recent LUBA case or something related to that, that we really need to have these in the Code?

Mary Bridget Smith: That is right. They need to be listed as Land Use Regulations in the Development Code so that they can be relied on for development.

Greg James: Exactly. That's the action before us this evening. Any questions? Summary by staff?

Female Speaker from Audience: Can I ask a question?

Greg James: We are through the public testimony phase in the process; we are onto the staff, so let's get our staff summary.

SUMMATION FROM STAFF

Molly Markarian: I guess I would just say that, as stated in the staff report, we find that the subject Code Amendment is consistent with the criteria listed in Springfield Development Code Section 5.6-115a and request the Planning Commission to forward a Recommendation of Approval to the Springfield City Council.

REBUTTAL FROM THE APPLICANT

No Applicant

CLOSE OF THE HEARING

Greg James: Do we have any requests to continue? We don't have to do that?

Mary Bridget Smith: We don't have to. This is a legislative matter so it's in your discretion, but you need to make some record of what you want to do with the record and the Hearing.

Greg James: The record is open and the Hearing is open. Do I hear a motion to close the public record at this time?

Sean Dunn: I move to close the public record and the written record.

Nick Nelson: Second.

Greg James: Moved and seconded to close the public record and written record. All in favor say, "Aye."

All: Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

Greg James: Motion to close the hearing?

Tim Vohs: I move to close the public hearing.

Mike Koivula: Second.

Greg James: All in favor?

All: Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Greg James: Discussion on the proposal before us? Any comments?

Nick Nelson: It seems like what you're saying is "we need to get this into the development codes or compliance", so I'm in favor of it.

Greg James: I would just say to those in the audience, we certainly appreciate you coming and being part of this process, and your public testimony is very important to us. This Glenwood process is going to continue to develop over the years to come. I think it's very important that your voices are heard as this process moves forward, certainly, both at the Planning Commission level and at the City Council level and at the SUB and EWEB level as you're impacted by potential development. We appreciate your input to this process. Do I hear a motion? A motion?

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OR APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS OR DENIAL OF THE REQUEST BASED ON STAFF REPORT AND ORAL/WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

Sean Dunn: Sure, I move to forward the recommendation to the City Council to approve Journal number 811-17-000137-TYP4, Amendment to the Springfield Development Code regarding the Street Design Standards as proposed in Exhibit B to this agenda item because the amendments meet the applicable criteria of approval.

Tim Vohs: I second.

Greg James: Moved by Commissioner Dunn, seconded by Commissioner Vohs as stated to move recommendation forward to the City Council to approve 811-17-000137-TYP4 to the Developed Code, the Glenwood Riverfront Street Design Standards. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye."

All: Aye. 6; 0; 1 absent

Greg James: Opposed? Motion carries. Report of council action?

REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

Mike Koivula: I attended last night's City Council. Appointed members for the budget committee and the museum committee. Nice discussion by Councilor Woodrow about a visit to Food for Lane County. They continue to need a lot of help to keep people fed. City Manager has proposed a wastewater flow management study for infiltration on wastewater lines. A private contractor by the name of Novak will be doing that. \$340,000 was the initial contribution of City fund. That was pretty much it.

Greg James: Okay. Other business from the Planning Commission?

BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION

Tim Vohs: I have one quick question not related to tonight's current proceedings. I'll direct my question to Brenda to start with. Looking toward our next meeting with Lane County on the transportation issue, considering that our audience has diminished considerably, is there a possibility that considering moving us to the back of the Library Meeting Room for our next Joint Meeting?

Brenda Jones: Yes. I could make sure that's arranged.

Tim Vohs: Thank you.

Nick Nelson: One other comment, a couple of editorials recently in the *Register Guard* and a number of letters, also, I've been into a couple of community meetings where the ADU's were discussed. There's a lot of kudos to the City, to the City Council, and to staff for working on this proposal and everybody who's been involved in that should really proud of what the community is seeing from the commitment that the City is doing towards affordable housing.

Greg James: Absolutely. I was going to talk briefly about the ADU process as well. I think the City Council has not adopted that yet, is that correct? Have they taken any action on that?

Mary Bridget Smith: I think they just did.

Greg James: They did? Just did?

Mary Bridget Smith: Yes.

Greg James: That's incredible. I know they have had several work sessions and talked through a proposal that we forwarded on to them. Those Accessory Dwelling Units, I think, are going to be a very positive thing for this community, the ability to create Accessory Dwelling Units. We'll see over the next two or three years how that develops and how that moves forward but certainly, I know planners I've talked to in Eugene, and other folks, City Councilors even from Eugene said, "You guys are ahead on the game on this," and we are telling them to catch up. Kudos to the staff for that vision and our City Council as well.

Okay. Any other business? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Brenda Jones

[Greg James](#)

Greg James
Planning Commission Chair

[Brenda Jones](#)

Attest:
Brenda Jones
Planning Commission Assistant