



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
541-923-7724
(Fax) 541-548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
411 SW 9th Street– Council Chambers
Redmond, OR 97756
Monday, October 16, 2017
6:30 PM

Agenda

UAPC Members

**James
Cook,
Chair**

**William
Hilton,
Vice Chair**

**David
Allen**

**Ross
Centers**

**Alicia
Wobbe**

**Joseph
Zika**

Vacant

**Youth Ex
Officio
Vacant**

- I. CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS**
- II. CITIZENS COMMENTS**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. August 28, 2017
 - b. September 11, 2017
 - c. October 2, 2017
- IV. DISCUSSION**
 - a. Parks Master Plan Update – Annie McVay
- V. STAFF COMMENTS**
- VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- VII. ADJOURN**

Next Planning Commission meeting, November 6, 2017

*Please note that these documents are also available on the City's website www.ci.redmond.or.us; click on City Government, hover on Commissions and Committees, click on Urban Area Planning Commission. You may also request a copy from City Records Office 923-7751 or email KellyM@ci.redmond.or.us

Anyone needing accommodation to participate in the meeting must notify ADA Coordinator, at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at (541) 504-3036, or through the Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS) which enables people who have difficulty hearing or speaking in the telephone to communicate to standard voice telephone users. If anyone needs Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) or Speech To Speech (STS) assistance, please use one of the following TRS numbers: 1-800-735-2900 (voice or text), 1-877-735-7525 (STS English) or 1-800-735-3896 (STS Spanish). The City of Redmond does not discriminate on the basis of disability status in the admission or access to, or treatment, or employment in, its programs or activities.



DRAFT

CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756-2213

Phone **541-923-77544**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

August 28, 2017

Redmond City Hall, 411 SW 9th Street, Council Chambers, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair James Cook, Vice-Chair William Hilton, David Allen, Alicia Wobbe, Joseph Zika III (*absent: Ross Centers; 1 vacancy*)

Youth Ex Officio: Vacant

City Staff: Scott Woodford, *Senior Planner*; Deborah McMahon, *Planning Manager*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Curtis Havniear, Larry Havniear, and Tucker Mayberry (developer/owner team); Grant Hardgrave, *Hickman Williams & Associates Inc.*; James Lewis, *Planning Consultant*; Joe Bessman; *Transight Consulting, LLC*; John Ropp and Chris Quinn, *The Broker Network of Central Oregon*; Barbara Marshall, Beth Agnew; Camille Fetzer-Lockhart; Christi Saucedo; Corlene Cran; Debbie Henderson Norton; Eve Ponder; Gary Wing; Jim Booth; Joe Ayres; Joel Hermsen; John Landry; John Eskeldson; Judy Hauk; Karen Hittle; Kimeric and Agnes DeLashmutt; LaNaya Strouse; Larry Morris; Les Maddox; Lynn Dagenhardt; Margaret Iverson; Margaret Rainwater; Mike and Judy Bolander; Mike O'Leary; Roger and Nancy Rupp; Steve Lundgren; Susan Trumm; Tim Hopfer; Wassa Starr

Media: Dave Morgan, *RedmondNewsToday.com*

(Agenda items appear in the order discussed. The 3 digits after a motion title show the number of commissioners voting in favor/opposed/abstaining.)

I. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Cook called the regular meeting of the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission (PC) to order at 6:36 p.m. with a quorum of commissioners (5 of 6) present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. None Available

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Dry Canyon Village PUD – Master Development Plan, Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, Tentative Subdivision Plat
Chair Cook read a summary of the applicant's (Sahhali Village of Redmond, LLC) request and the hearing procedures into the record. Commissioner Cook declared ex parte communication due to a text message from Anne Graham which he e-mailed to

Ms. McMahon. He stated there was no dialogue about the Master Development Plan under consideration at this hearing. No other commissioners declared any pre-hearing contact, ex parte observation, or conflict of interest. No one challenged any commissioner's ability to hear this matter based on bias, prejudice, or personal interest. Chair Cook opened the public hearing on City Files 711-17-000130-MD, 711-17-000134-SUB, 711-17-000147-CU, 711-17-000149-ZMA, 711-17-000150-PUD, and 711-17-000151-PA at 6:40 p.m.

Staff report: Ms. McMahon explained why 19th Street residents didn't receive notice of this hearing, how the error was discovered on August 22, and how it was corrected. She outlined the review procedure and notice requirements and defined a planned unit development.

Mr. Woodford presented (PowerPoint) the staff report and discussed the context, Northwest Area Plan, existing and proposed zoning, master plan statistics, tentative subdivision plat and phasing, proposed products, park locations and amenities, streets, trails and sidewalks, and review criteria. Sahhali Village of Redmond, LLC, applied for approval of a 504-lot/unit residential project on 76.6 acres. The development proposal consisted of 203 single-family lots, 60 duplex lots, 30 accessory dwelling units, 32 townhome units, and 180 multi-family units. An age-restricted (55+ years) community would be built south of Spruce Avenue.

Applicant's presentation:

Mr. Lewis (planning consultant) said some comments offered at a public meeting in June 2017 were accommodated into the design. He introduced the project team members and discussed compliance with the Northwest Area Plan and other City requirements.

Tucker Mayberry (developer/owner) discussed the project's background, concept/intent, and how the City would benefit from this PUD (planned unit development).

Joe Bessman (traffic engineer) summarized results of the traffic study and analysis including number of trips generated, traffic impacts and safety, and neighborhood traffic management.

Mr. Lewis said the applicant would agree to a condition of approval to submit, prior to final plat approval for each subsequent phase, an analysis of the traffic impacts at that point.

Curtis Havnear (developer/owner) discussed profiles, elevations, amenities, and housing products planned for the age-restricted community.

John Ropp (sales manager) introduced his business partner, Chris Quinn, and said Dave Lepez (not present) would assist in the sales effort. His discussion covered the need for new housing based on in-migration statistics and population forecasts to the year 2065.

Commissioners requested clarification on garage setbacks, on-street parking, design review exemption for single-family areas, streetscapes, level sidewalks in senior developments, proximity of canyon rim, impacts of full development of the Maple Avenue Master Plan on this project, timing of sewer connections, construction timeline, impact on the development south of Maple Avenue, if number of exceptions on this project was higher/lower than in the past, traffic impacts on existing streets, responsibility for monitoring traffic impacts by phase, if land uses for each phase would be reviewed and approved separately, if separate conditions of approval were needed for each phase, time of day the traffic studies were done, traffic speeds and turn lanes on Northwest Way, left turns out of the development, type of

housing products on smaller lots, homeowner associations (number, what is covered), and traffic-calming solutions.

Mr. Lewis responded to commissioner concerns. He stated the applicant would agree to separate conditions of approval.

Ms. McMahon responded to commissioner concerns about the City transportation system.

Chair Cook called a break at 8:36 p.m. and reopened the meeting at 8:45 p.m. He outlined guidelines for public testimony.

Public testimony:

Christi Saucedo asked why transportation solutions couldn't be implemented proactively and why there weren't more entrances to the 55+ community from Northwest Way. Mr. Woodford said City code limited the number of curb cuts on arterial streets. Commissioner Hilton responded to her concerns about neighborhood traffic management.

Debbie Henderson Norton requested copies of the presentations made at tonight's hearing. Her concerns included annexation timeline, requiring construction traffic to access the project from Northwest Way, retaining property values of current residents (fencing or other buffers between new developments and existing neighborhoods, impact of new 4,800-square-foot lots against existing 9,800-square-foot lots), recreational vehicle parking, need for a stop sign at Quince, access from 22nd Street, and impact of traffic from the new project on existing neighborhoods. Chair Cook suggested she download the presentations from the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission page on the City website. Ms. McMahon explained the annexation process. Curtis Havniar discussed how construction traffic would be managed.

Steve Lundgren expressed concerns about impacts from the population increase (number of people allowed per lot, number of kids), bus requirements, number of trips generated per day (how and where measured), accessory dwelling units (ADUs) used as transient rentals, and R-4 and R-5 zoning requirements (on-street parking, lot sizes). Mr. Lewis estimated the number of residents per lot within this development would be fewer than the U.S. average of 2.6 persons per household. Ms. McMahon briefly discussed the City's need for housing choices and responded to his concerns about bus access, on-street parking, and lot sizes. Commissioner Wobbe expressed support for smaller lot sizes.

Margaret Iverson objected to on-street parking as being unsafe. Additional concerns included emergency vehicle access, which streets the driveways in the north section would exit to, and the need for the traffic study to measure volumes during school commute times. Mr. Bessman responded to her concerns about traffic management within the development.

Eve Ponder asked about parking for lots other than single-family, responsibility for code enforcement (boats and recreational vehicles parked on sidewalks and bike lanes), and homeowner associations (how managed with single-family and multi-family developments, who enforces). Mr. Lewis noted the City is a party to CC&Rs (covenants, conditions & restrictions) of homeowner associations.

Wassa Starr asked why roads needed for the expected new population couldn't be built now. Additional concerns included access route for construction traffic, lack of enforcement of existing 25 mile-per-hour (mph) speed limit, and impact of this development on Elton Gregory

Middle School students. Mr. Bessman responded to his concerns about the August 9, 2017, traffic study. Chair Cook suggested Mr. Starr call the nonemergency phone number for the police department and report the lack of code enforcement to City Council.

Jim Booth expressed his opposition to higher housing density on the north half of the development. Additional concerns included substandard development (lot sizes, street frontage, setbacks, street right-of-way width), inadequate access for garbage trucks, and lack of amenities (schools, shopping, jobs, public transportation). What will the smaller housing units look like now and in 20 years? Mr. Lewis explained why PUD exceptions were needed.

Kimeric DeLashmutt presented a letter and expressed concern about the number of homes proposed (344 or 504), impacts of this higher-density housing project (compatibility with his 23-year-old ranching business, increased crime), state statute regarding uses compatible with agricultural lands, traffic study measurements and monitoring. Mr. Lewis responded to his concerns about the number of residential units and said there would be no manufactured homes. Ms. McMahon said she would need a specific state law reference in order to research Mr. DeLashmutt's compatible use concern. She offered to provide the Planning Commission with policies and objectives from the comprehensive plan about the UH-10 (Urban Holding) zone and uses within the urban growth boundary.

Joel Hermesen suggested solutions to address public concerns about traffic congestion. He proposed implementing speed limits on 19th and 22nd Streets, said back alleys were useless, and urged the City to not throw away good neighborhoods for higher-density developments. Who will be responsible for plowing the private roads? Commissioner Hilton responded to his concerns about speed limits.

Larry Morris asked about the average number of trips per day per resident, impact on Maple Avenue, and the need for another east-west corridor. Mr. Bessman responded to his concerns about trip generation.

Joe Ayres asked if speeds on 19th Street could be kept down to 25 mph to protect the safety and livelihood of 19th Street residents. He was also concerned about construction traffic routes and project access points. Curtis Havnear responded to his concerns about construction traffic. Chair Cook and Commissioner Hilton recommended Mr. Ayres talk to City staff about speed concerns on local streets.

Susan Trumm said more traffic studies were needed. Her concerns included current high speeds on Northwest Way, impact of this project on existing EFU (exclusive farm use) homeowners, increasing water capacity through the City other than by drilling new wells, and contamination of irrigation ditches. She urged the City to not allow the proposed PUD exceptions and to stick to the current R-4 and R-5 zoning.

Mr. Hermesen said several of his neighbors were unable to testify at tonight's hearing due to their absence or the length of the hearing.

Ms. McMahon reported receiving a request to keep the record open to accommodate a person who didn't have enough time to review the staff report prior to tonight's hearing. She asked the Planning Commission to keep the record open for written testimony until September 11, 2017.

Mr. Lewis said the applicant would provide responses to the Planning Commission questions prior to the September 11 hearing. He requested clarification on the following points: Would oral testimony and written testimony be allowed on September 11? Would the applicant have seven days (to September 18) to rebut the written testimony and to waive rebuttal if desired? Will the September 11 hearing be limited to Planning Commission deliberation?

Commissioners discussed procedural concerns with staff.

Motion 1 (5/0/0): Commissioner Allen moved to continue the public hearing to September 11, 2017, 6:30 p.m., in City Hall and that the record remain open for oral and written testimony. Commissioner Wobbe seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Chair Cook called a second break at 10:16 p.m. and reopened the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

B. Higher Density Overlay Zones

Chair Cook read a summary of the applicant's (City of Redmond) request and the hearing procedures into the record. No commissioner declared any pre-hearing contacts, ex parte observation, or conflict of interest. No one challenged any commissioner's ability to hear this matter based on bias, prejudice, or personal interest. Chair Cook opened the public hearing on City File 711-HDoverlay-GA4 and related text amendments at 10:25 p.m.

Staff report: Ms. McMahon presented the staff report and said it had been reviewed with the City's attorney for land use issues. She discussed how current densities in Redmond compared to those in other Oregon cities (Albany, Bend, Eugene, Portland, Springfield), unique aspects of this proposal, and design guidelines. She reported receiving one letter in opposition to the higher density proposed for this project.

Public testimony: None.

Commissioner concerns included the two-track review process to be done by staff instead of the Planning Commission, maximum building height in the comparison cities, balancing density with livability, parking, and why the desired density was 30 units per acre.

Ms. McMahon explained what the Planning Commission was being asked to review and recommend to Council.

Motion 2 (5/0/0): Commissioner Allen moved to recommend City Council approval of the proposed map and text amendments as contained in the August 22, 2017, staff report from Deborah McMahon. Commissioner Wobbe seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. McMahon said she would prepare findings to support the Planning Commission's recommendation.

V. STAFF COMMENTS

Upcoming meetings:

- Monday, September 11, 2017, 6:30 p.m. – Dry Canyon Village PUD public hearing (continued)
- Monday, September 18, 2017, 6:30 p.m. – regular meeting

VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Wobbe thanked staff for the snacks.

VII. ADJOURN

Motion 3 (5/0/0): Commissioner Zika moved to adjourn. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

With no further business, Chair Cook adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2017.

ATTEST:

James Cook
Chair

Deborah McMahon
Planning Manager



DRAFT

CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756-2213

Phone **541-923-77544**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 11, 2017

Redmond City Hall, 411 SW 9th Street, Council Chambers, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair James Cook, Vice-Chair William Hilton, David Allen, Ross Centers, Alicia Wobbe, Joseph Zika III (1 vacancy)

Youth Ex Officio: Vacant

City Staff: Scott Woodford, *Senior Planner*; Deborah McMahon, *Planning Manager*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Curtis Havnear, Larry Havnear, and Tucker Mayberry (developer/owner team); Grant Hardgrave, *Hickman Williams & Associates Inc.*; James Lewis, *Planning Consultant*; Anne Graham; Bill Schertzing; Bob and Linda Rock, Brodie and Kathy Birch, Camille Fetzer-Lockhart; Cathy Edgerton; Christi Saucedo; Dale and Jan Breeske; David and Karen Kowal; Dean Lanouette; Debbie Henderson-Norton; Debi and Matt Diamond; Denice Ellis; Dennis and Pamela Heman; Don Harmon; Donald Glueck; Ed Boehmer; Elaine Spalinger; Eleanor Pope; Eve Ponder; Gina Jauregui; Janet Coughlin; Jim Booth; Joel Hermsen; John Eskeldson; John Herbison; John and Dana Holliday; John Landry; Judy Hammack; Kathie Conley; Kimeric and Agnes DeLashmutt; Leni Dowty; Liz Scanlon; Louis and Rosa Draghi; Nancy Anderson; Nathan Matlock; Robert M. Boyd; Robin Estes; Roger and Nancy Rupp; Rosie Kirwan; Russell Green; Stephen Nye; Steve and Teresa Reed; Teri Wise; Tim Hopfer

Media: None

(Agenda items appear in the order discussed. The 3 digits after a motion title show the number of commissioners voting in favor/opposed/abstaining.)

I. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Cook called the meeting of the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission (PC) to order at 6:32 p.m. with a quorum of commissioners (6 of 6) present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. August 7, 2017

Motion 1 (6/0/0): Commissioner Zika moved to approve the August 7, 2017, minutes as submitted. Commissioner Hilton seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Dry Canyon Village PUD – Master Development Plan, Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, Tentative Subdivision Plat

Chair Cook continued the public hearing on City Files 711-17-000130-MD, 711-17-000134-SUB, 711-17-000147-CU, 711-17-000149-ZMA, 711-17-000150-PUD, and 711-17-000151-PA at 6:34 p.m.

Many members of the audience sitting behind the first two rows declared they could not hear what was being said. Ms. McMahon replied the sound volume was set at the maximum.

Staff report: Ms. McMahon reviewed the background and related planning documents (Redmond Framework Plan, Redmond Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Map, Northwest Area Plan, Redmond City Code Chapter 8 – Development Regulations) which affected how the proposed project could develop. She reported the applicant had not submitted any new information. Comment letters received by the City have not produced any new information. She recommended keeping the record open for new oral testimony at tonight's hearing.

Applicant's response:

James Lewis (planning consultant) stated no changes had been made to the proposed design or plans since the August 28 hearing. He said the applicant would rely on letters submitted by himself, Joe Bessman (traffic engineer), and Larry Havniear (owner/developer) to clarify concerns raised by commissioners and citizens at the last hearing. He explained why the applicant's proposal included a PUD. He stated the applicant agreed to the City's amended conditions of approval regarding transportation improvements to be constructed in Phase 1. He responded to the DeLashmutts' concern about the lack of a rural/urban interface, stating the interface was not required as their property and the subject property were both within the urban growth boundary. He responded to Anne Graham's concern about exceptions to minimum lot sizes, noting the exceptions were needed to meet density requirements.

Larry Havniear (owner/developer) discussed his family's background in Central Oregon, his professional training, Central Oregon Board of Realtors awards (3), and developer team qualifications. He said three of the buildings his family owned in Central Oregon were currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Commissioners clarified the type of housing products proposed for the very small lots, parking requirements for lots with accessory dwelling units, lot sizes, sidewalk standards, park area and open space, and trail connections. Mr. Lewis responded to commissioner concerns.

Chair Cook said, based on the number of people who indicated they wanted to testify, oral testimony would be limited to three minutes per person. Ms. McMahon explained why staff and the applicant were not subject to the three-minute rule regarding their presentations. The Planning Commission requested a complete staff report and the applicant had the burden of proving of the proposed project met all the requirements. Commissioner Allen outlined the review process for the benefit of the public which included both Planning Commission and City Council public hearings.

Public testimony:

Dale Breeske provided a jump drive and copies of his remarks to the Planning Commission. He expressed concern about impacts on livability and safety for the existing neighborhood from increasing density, increasing traffic, and lack of curbs and sidewalks along 19th and 22nd Streets. He requested the developer be required to provide additional access streets from Northwest Way and implement traffic-calming strategies to slow down and control traffic through the existing neighborhood.

Anne Graham challenged Commissioner Allen's comment about the likelihood of Council's changing the Planning Commission recommendation. She reported having written comments but said she wouldn't address them in the interest of time. Other concerns included the need to revisit the Great Neighborhood Principles, lack of phasing, requiring deadlines and performance bonds to assure that all phases would be built, reducing the size of the PUD, and reducing the expected build-out duration.

Kathie Conley expressed concern about neighborhood safety due to lack of traffic controls and speeds higher than 25 miles per hour (mph) from existing traffic and the potential for increased traffic due to the proposed development.

Louis Draghi agreed that Redmond needed more housing but said more density shouldn't be concentrated in one area but spread around town. Additional concerns included traffic, property values, and crime. He recommended the people building the additional density be required to live with it.

Dean Lanouette said the traffic engineer had made a false statement on Page 4, Paragraph 2, of his report about the access to 19th Street from adjacent residences. He stated he was concerned about the impact of Maple Meadows' construction and construction from this project on the 19th/Maple Avenue intersection.

Christi Saucedo stated the residents in the existing neighborhood were not receiving proper notice of Planning Commission meetings about this project. She recommended the Planning Commission decrease speed limits on Northwest Way, increase the number of entrances and exits for the neighborhood, and install traffic counters on 19th and 22nd Streets between Maple and Poplar Avenues and between Sterling and Spruce or Redwood and Spruce Avenues for one to two weeks before construction begins. She said existing traffic volumes at these locations were much greater than the traffic engineer had stated.

John Eskeldson reported sending written comments about traffic to Ms. McMahon and Mr. Woodford on September 3. He said the design of the section of 19th Street north of Maple made it dangerous for residents there to back out of their driveways. While it appears the Dry Canyon Village plans complied with a lot of the Northwest Area Plan, the area people will have to drive through wasn't designed to handle a lot of traffic.

John Landry expressed concerns about decreasing property values (due to increased density, increased traffic and crime) and compatibility of the existing R-1 neighborhood with the project's R-4 and R-5 zoning. He recommended requiring the developer to make a real buffer zone (greenbelt or row of R-1 housing) behind 22nd Street. He also suggested the City ask the developer for money up front to cover school and road improvements. He told commissioners their decision would set a tone for the rest of the development.

Stephen Nye said his main concern was traffic on 19th Street and Maple Avenue. He suggested installing a roundabout, not a traffic signal, to keep traffic flowing. He said as a school bus driver he could get around a roundabout very easily.

Ed Boehmer suggested the developer use more realistic architectural renderings of the proposed housing products as there were no palm trees in Redmond.

Debbie Henderson-Norton said her main concerns were compatibility of the proposed development with the existing neighborhood, driveway size for single-family homes, and parking on 19th and 22nd Streets. She recommended the developer not be allowed a 50-foot

right-of-way on Spruce or Quince Avenues. She suggested installing a safety lane for ingress/egress to the new subdivision, so traffic could go onto Northwest Way without going through the existing neighborhood. She said the new canyon trail access was good and asked if trails in the 55+ gated subdivision would be public.

Joel Hermesen said he was not told when he bought his house there would be more intense development in the future. His concerns included neighborhood compatibility, environmental study on the property, housing values, how often Council overturned Planning Commission recommendations, construction noise, and lack of law enforcement. He recommended the speed limit on 19th Street be 25 mph from Maple all the way through.

Mr. Breeske asked what would stop Terrebonne people from going through his neighborhood using 19th and 23rd Streets instead of Northwest Way to get to 19th and Maple.

Jim Booth asked why planning staff favored high-density housing at the far northwest corner of the urban growth boundary. Based on his internet research, high-density housing should be built in the downtown core. Building high-density housing on the edge of Redmond would create a need for more infrastructure to serve it. He recommended cutting the high-density housing out of the proposed development. He noted that the fourth requirement for a PUD in the R-4 and R-5 zones, which he quoted as “the proposed use will not conflict with, diminish, or substantially adversely affect the character and the nature of the established neighborhood in which it is located,” was not met by the proposed development.

Don Glueck asked what the definition of “very low income” was. His concerns included the type of people moving into his neighborhood and that packing people into high-density housing would create slums. He expressed support for gated housing for seniors. Ms. McMahon said low-income housing was typically for people making \$16,000-\$23,000 per year. She stated the proposal contained a variety of market-rate housing types but would not include subsidized housing.

Agnes DeLashmutt thanked Mr. Woodford for sharing the letter from her and her husband with the Planning Commission. She recommended the Planning Commission reject the plan outright due to being inconsistent with Redmond city code and goals (Master Development Plan, Paragraph 1, and neighborhood principle H) and with Statewide Goal 3, Paragraph A. She also objected to the many exceptions to the code criteria including minimum lot size (Redmond city code Section 8.040). She stated the proposed development would not benefit the City of Redmond, adjacent rural landowners, or residents of the Dry Canyon PUD.

Don Harmon asked how close homes in this development would be to each other. Ms. McMahon replied that setbacks between homes would vary from 5 to 15 feet, depending on the type of housing unit.

Ms. Henderson-Norton said she was an adjacent (affected) property owner to the whole proposal and had never received notice. Mr. Woodford said that, since the application was for a rezone, the standard notice requirements were expanded from 100 feet to 250 feet. Two different mailings were sent out to the mailing list generated by the DIAL system on the Deschutes County Assessor’s website. He asked citizens within 250 feet of the rezone boundary who did not receive notice to contact him on September 12.

Denise Ellis asked how many people were allowed to live in a certain area as 523 units could be three to five thousand people. She also expressed concern about traffic speeds around the park and who would be maintaining the roads used by construction traffic.

Ms. McMahon summarized the review process to date and the Planning Commission's options for proceeding. She said staff believed the applicant's proposal had not changed. Staff recommended the Planning Commission close the oral record and move forward with its deliberation on the application details. Commissioner questions of the developer should be addressed before closing the record.

Mr. Lewis said many decisions about density, traffic connections to Northwest Way, and what was studied in the traffic analysis were outside the developers' control. Those decisions were made by the City during the urban growth boundary expansion, creation of the Northwest Area Plan, and adoption of standards for evaluating traffic impacts. He said the project's overall density averaged 7.7 units per acre, which was at the low end of the density requirement. He stated the applicant's belief that the proposed development complied with all the criteria and requested a decision from the Planning Commission tonight.

Chair Cook asked if properties backing up to the park would be fenced and if there would be regulations to make the fencing somewhat consistent. Mr. Lewis said the applicant could put provisions in the CC&Rs (covenants, conditions, and restrictions) about consistency of fences built within the development. He noted the City had stringent fencing standards to ensure maintenance and a base level of design.

Commissioner Wobbe asked about parking. Mr. Lewis replied that, according to the Park Master Plan, the park would be designed to serve the residents in that area and would have parking on the public street adjacent to the park.

Chair Cook closed the public record for oral and written testimony at 8:13 p.m.

Commissioners' deliberation covered whether traffic concerns raised at tonight's hearing would be considered when the transportation system plan was updated, why the urban/rural interface didn't apply, difference between the City Engineer's recommendation dated September 7, 2017, and conditions of approval contained in the staff reports, traffic speeds, traffic controls, and if the City Engineer's report had been made available to everyone.

Ms. McMahon responded to commissioner concerns and said staff could meet with citizens individually to help them understand what was in the record of this hearing.

Commissioner Centers thanked audience members for their heartfelt input in the review process including tonight's hearing. He discussed the challenge of living in a community experiencing rapid and positive growth and the value of welcoming new residents. He suggested all citizens were called upon to welcome their neighbors and said the Planning Commission's job was to make certain that happened in the best way possible.

Chair Cook thanked audience members who expressed their opinion of the proposed development plan. He said if anyone wanted the opportunity to help make some of the decisions, the Planning Commission currently had a vacant position and applications were available on the website and from staff. He thanked staff for answering his questions.

Commissioner Allen said he appreciated everyone coming out for this hearing. He briefly discussed the need to balance current neighborhoods with new ones and the need to balance neighborhood concerns with professional recommendations.

Motion 2 (6/0/0): Commissioner Allen moved to recommend approval of the Dry Canyon Village PUD Master Plan, City Files 711-17-000130-MD, 711-17-000134-SUB,

711-17-000147-CU, 711-17-000149-ZMA, 711-17-000150-PUD, and 711-17-000151-PA, subject to the revised conditions of approval. Commissioner Hilton seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Chair Cook asked members of the public wishing to continue discussion to do so outside Council Chambers so planning commissioners could finish addressing items on their agenda.

V. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. McMahon requested cancellation of the September 18 meeting. In the interim, staff will be working to finish work associated with the revitalization grant and preparing a resolution on the high-density overlay zone for Council consideration.

Next meeting: Monday, October 2, 2017, 6:30 p.m.

VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chair Cook recommended that staff prioritize cleanup of the PUD part of the Redmond Development Code update first.

Commissioner Allen requested the Planning Commission meet with City Council to discuss the number of units approved in the last 12 months and how to make sure all phases of an approved master plan are built out. Commissioner Centers said he agreed with Commissioner Allen's master plan build-out concerns. Vice-Chair Hilton asked if bonding was appropriate to ensure build-out of master plan phases.

Ms. McMahon said staff would work with the City Attorney, the City's land use attorney, and the Oregon Planners Network to research what other cities were doing.

VII. ADJOURN

Motion 3 (6/0/0): Commissioner Allen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Hilton seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

With no further business, Chair Cook adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2017.

ATTEST:

James Cook
Chair

Deborah McMahon
Planning Manager



DRAFT

CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756-2213

Phone **541-923-77544**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 2, 2017

Redmond City Hall, 411 SW 9th Street – Council Chambers, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair James Cook, David Allen, Alicia Wobbe, Joseph Zika III
(*absent: Vice-Chair William Hilton, Ross Centers; 1 vacancy*)

Youth Ex Officio: Vacant

City Staff: Deborah McMahon, *Planning Manager*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Garry Finley; Geoff Harris, *Hayden Homes*; Tory Allman, *City Councilor*

Media: None

(Agenda items appear in the order discussed. The 3 digits after a motion title show the number of commissioners voting in favor/opposed/abstaining.)

I. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Cook called the regular meeting of the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission (PC) to order at 6:33 p.m. with a quorum of commissioners (4 of 6) present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. August 17, 2017

Commissioners were unable to provide visitor information missing from the August 17 minutes. Ms. Prow said she would remove blanks left for the missing information.

Motion 1 (4/0/0): Commissioner Zika moved to approve the August 17, 2017, minutes. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

IV. BEGIN DIALOGUE ON PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND CONCEPTS

A. Review Older PUD Standards

B. Compare to Current PUD Standards

Ms. McMahon reminded commissioners they agreed to modify the work plan to assign a higher priority to review of PUD standards. The original PUD concept was to preserve natural areas, open space, and flexibility for home development around such features. She discussed problems with the current PUD standards.

Commissioner discussion covered:

- **Development history/philosophy:** How did subdivisions develop in the past compared to now? Does the PUD process deliver a better product than a non-PUD process? Market-driven vs. regulation. What's built now is driven more by what builders want to do. Developers need to be clear on what they want to achieve. Neither the Planning Commission nor the City should attempt to regulate the market. How can the City assure that three generations of people can live close together? How can staff be empowered to achieve the Planning Commission's vision? Relying on market forces to achieve the goal of providing a housing mix might not yield the desired result. Impact of density requirements on innovation. Do built-out PUDs exist that demonstrate how density requirements were met? What incentives would encourage developers to build different housing types in earlier phases? Timing of commercial development.
- **Master plan build-out:** Assure the areas outside a PUD in an approved master plan will be built. What would the City do if the balance of a master plan were not built? Focus on solutions to Master Plan concerns before addressing PUD issues. Can the City veto homeowner association rule changes in CC&Rs (covenants, conditions & restrictions)? Redmond can't rely on private contracts to meet City needs.
- **Marketing studies:** Validity of consultant studies. Why would the City require market studies from developers? Why should developers be responsible for telling the City what type of housing is needed at any particular time?
- **Outreach:** Invite nonprofit organizations (Habitat for Humanity, Neighbor Impact) to work with market-rate developers. Can planning commissioners attend COBA (Central Oregon Builders Association) meetings and visit with developers outside commission meetings?
- **Better information needed:** Dialogue with the housing industry including COBA, Housing Works, and Community Development Block Grant staff. How can the City get more housing built? What barriers need to be reduced or removed? What incentives would drive builders to construct the type of housing Redmond needs?

Ms. McMahon recommended the Planning Commission schedule a work session with interested parties before meeting with them individually.

V. STAFF COMMENTS

Next meeting: Monday, October 16, 2017, 6:30 p.m.

VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Zika said an appreciation meeting for all City commissions and committees was scheduled for October 11, not October 17.

VII. ADJOURN

Motion 2 (4/0/0): Commissioner Allen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wobbe seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

With no further business, Chair Cook adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2017.

ATTEST:

James Cook
Chair

Deborah McMahon
Planning Manager



CITY OF REDMOND
Public Works Department
Parks Division

243 E. Antler Ave
Redmond, OR 97756

(541) 504-5000
Fax: (541) 923-2754
info@ci.redmond.or.us
www.ci.redmond.or.us

STAFF REPORT

DATE: October 16, 2017
TO: Planning Commission
THROUGH: Keith Witcosky, City Manager
Deborah McMahon, Planning Manager
Bill Duerden, Public Works Director
FROM: Annie McVay, Parks Division Manager
SUBJECT: Consider Approving the Parks Master Plan Update

Note: The draft plan is too large to email but you can send the Commission the following link to access and/or download the document. www.ci.redmond.or.us/parksplan Hard copies can be requested by calling 541.504.2000.

Addresses Council Goal:

Goal 6C: Community Enhancement - Invest in the use of public participation and community engagement in public policy decisions.

Goal 6F: Community Enhancement - Strive for an interconnected community of parks and open spaces: Collaborate with community partners to ensure Redmond residents have access to parks and open space amenities.

Report in Brief:

The City of Redmond is requesting Planning Commission approval of the Parks Master Plan Update.

Background:

The Parks Master Plan, adopted in 2008, requires an update to better reflect the current and future needs of the Redmond Parks System. In October 2016, the City procured consulting services from Conservation Technix to assist in developing an update to the Parks Master Plan. The City established a Parks Master Plan Task Force to help guide the effort.

Using a public participation based process, the consultant completed an existing conditions survey of the parks system, conducted a needs assessment and gap analysis, and helped develop a prioritized parks project improvements list which reflects community priorities.

Discussion:

With guidance from the Parks Master Plan Task Force, City staff worked closely with Conservation Technix to develop the Draft Parks Master Plan.

Major chapters of the plan include:

Community Listening – highlights the methods used to engage the Redmond community in the

development of the Plan and provides insights from past community planning efforts. Outreach efforts included:

- Establishing a Parks Master Plan Task Force that met regularly throughout the process
 - Online-based community surveys (2013 & 2016)
 - Seven stakeholder discussions (two group & five individual)
 - Two public open houses
 - mySidewalk online engagement
 - Social media content & emails
- Park System Inventory & Classifications – describes the existing parks and recreation system in the City and provides an inventory and evaluation of the parks and facilities.
 - Needs Assessment – Provides a conditions assessment of the current park infrastructure. Also discusses community feedback and other recreation trend data and provides context to the identification of potential park system enhancements.
 - Goals & Actions – provides a policy framework for the parks system grouped by major functional or program area. The main categories for Redmond to focus on in the next ten years are: Citizen Involvement; Park and Open Space Acquisition; Park Design and Development; Trails and Linkages; Wellness and Heritage; and Administration and Management.
 - Implementation - describes a range of strategies to consider in the implementation of the Plan and provides a 10-year program for addressing park and facility enhancement or expansion projects.
 - Dry Canyon Master Plan – a chapter of the plan is dedicated to the management of the Dry Canyon. A plan specific to the Dry Canyon recognizes the special and unique requirements for the management and long term sustainability of the Canyon to include access, parking, appropriate allowed uses and development criteria.
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan – this plan was adopted by the City of Redmond Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee in 2016. The goals and needs for bicycle and pedestrian planning interrelate with those identified for trails and linkages of parks. The Parks Master Plan incorporates the existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan to reinforce cooperative efforts and planning City wide.

The Draft Parks Master Plan was presented on an August 17, 2017 Working Session of the Parks Committee and Planning Commission. Since the Working Session, the plan was released for public comment. The public comment period ended on October 6, 2017, one comment was received that expressed concern for parking in the Dry Canyon. The plan was presented for approval at the October 11, 2017 Parks Committee meeting, since the meeting is after the preparation of this report a summary will be given at the meeting.

Fiscal Impact:

The Parks Master Plan develops a prioritized project list for the park system. Funding for the specific projects will be System Development Charge, Parks Capital Projects or other funding sources and will be identified through the annual budget cycle.

Alternative Courses of Action:

1. Recommend approval of the Parks Master Plan Update.
2. Reject the Parks Master Plan Update.
3. Request more information.

Recommendation/Suggested Motion:

“The Planning Commission recommends approval of the Parks Master Plan Update.”

Annie McVay
Parks Division Manager