



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 Schertzinger; 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 16th day of October, 2017.

ATTEST:

/s/James Cook
James Cook
Chair

/s/ Deborah McMahon
Deborah McMahon
Planning Manager