



**CITY OF REDMOND**  
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue  
Redmond, OR 97756-2242

Phone **541-923-7721**  
Fax **541-548-0706**

[www.ci.redmond.or.us](http://www.ci.redmond.or.us)

## **REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes**

Monday, March 1, 2011  
City Council Chambers  
777 SW Deschutes Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chair Eric Porter, Vice Chair Will Van Vactor, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, John Nastari

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Margie Dawson, *City Councilor-Liaison*; Trish Pinkerton, *Redmond Spokesman*

**CITY STAFF:** Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; Mike Caccavano, *City Engineer*; David Pilling, *City Engineering Department*; Jon Williams, *Economic Development Project Manager*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

*(scribe CP's note: The minutes were created from an audio record and notes taken at the meeting. The three digits after the motion title shows the number of members voting in favor/against/abstaining.)*

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Porter opened the meeting at 7:03 p.m. with a quorum present.

#### **III. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)**

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### **B. City of Redmond Public Works Standards and Specifications**

Chair Porter opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. and read aloud the hearing procedures. No Commissioners disclosed ex parte contact, bias, or conflict of interest. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner.

Mr. Caccavano presented the staff report (Exhibit 2) and a handout on paving standards. The 2010 amendment to the City of Redmond Public Works Standards and Specifications was proposed to address changes in design and construction requirements, materials, methods, and references to other documents since the plan was updated in 2003. Impacts to initial construction costs will be offset by increased infrastructure lifespan, improved performance, and reduced maintenance expense.

Chair Porter opened the hearing to public testimony at 7:14 p.m. and closed it when no one offered comment.

Commissioner concerns included the *life expectancy of paving* (chip seal versus overlay) and the *effect of studded tires on pavement life*.

**Motion 1 (5/0/0):** Commissioner Van Vactor moved to recommend that City Council adopt the proposed amendment to the City of Redmond Public Works Standards and Specifications as presented. Commissioner Nastari seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Chair Porter closed the hearing at 7:16 p.m.

A. 12<sup>th</sup> Amendment to Redmond Downtown Urban Renewal Plan

Chair Porter opened the public hearing at 7:20 p.m. and read aloud the hearing procedures. Commissioner Allman and Commissioner Van Vactor each disclosed being members of the Downtown Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (DURAC). No other Commissioners disclosed ex parte contact, bias, or conflict of interest. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner.

Mr. Williams made a PowerPoint presentation to facilitate discussion of the proposed expansion of the Downtown Urban Renewal District (DURD) and also presented a staff report (Exhibit 1). He summarized the district's history, research and strategy underlying the proposed amendment, target results, contents, financial analysis, findings and consistency with the City's comprehensive plan, and review timeline. The two-year public evaluation process before this hearing involved stakeholder surveys; parcel-by-parcel blight analysis; market analysis (local, regional, national trends); development opportunity analysis; case studies of communities with similar downtown concerns; reviews of existing plans, policies, and reports; community planning workshops; and meetings with business owners, property owners, community residents, and DURAC. The next public hearing on this issue will be held by City Council on April 12, 2011.

If adopted, the proposed amendment would expand the district by 102 acres, add 18 projects, allow acquisition of the Evergreen Elementary School property, increase the maximum indebtedness to \$120,717,081, and extend the 1995-2025 plan to 2031. Goals included making Redmond a first-choice community for raising a family or building a business in Central Oregon. Target results included eliminating blight, diversifying Redmond's economy, and increasing the size of the tax base within DURD boundaries. The proposed projects were evaluated on the basis of blight, tax increment creation, job creation, connection to other projects, leverage, community support, developer interest, planning, and family amenity.

Adopting the proposed plan amendment would not impact local school districts whose funds are distributed by the state, property taxes related to general obligation bond levies, or voter-approved local option levies. The total financial impact of urban renewal activities on a home valued at \$150,000 would be \$22.63 over a 20-year period. Proposed urban renewal projects would be paid for by leveraging \$93.6 million of urban renewal funds to attract \$444-\$800 million of new private investment.

Chair Porter opened the hearing to public testimony at 7:54 p.m.

- \* Don Fields (proponent) was concerned about the size of the proposed hotel/convention center project and requested a definition for "way finding."
- \* Larry Peterson (proponent) suggested clarifying the language regarding potential consequences for individual taxpayers. Does the \$22.63 nominal impact apply to each year or the total time the plan is in effect? Implementing the DURD 10 years ago was a good idea. Expanding it now is also a good move.
- \* Steve Hudspeth (proponent) said he agreed with Mr. Peterson about the positive impact of the current DURD and the benefits to be gained from expanding it at this time.
- \* Richard Long (opponent) read aloud his letter about financing concerns. Oregon cities Pendleton and Tualatin are examples of urban renewal failures and justify why public subsidies should not be given to private interests (developers). Redmond should pay off its current bonds and become debt-free.

- \* Jim Fenton (opponent) asked how the City could justify new investment when current buildings are not fully utilized. Raising taxes causes blight. Redmond should finish what it has now before expanding. The failures of Juniper Golf Course and the railroad depot prove that public and private business interests should not be combined. Redmond should establish neighborhood associations to increase public involvement in the decision-making process.
- \* Justin Schneider (neutral) questioned the eligibility criteria used to determine which parcels would be eligible for industrial opportunity funding. Why was the industrial park he owns not included within the expanded DURD boundary?

Chair Porter thanked those who testified and closed the public testimony part of the hearing at 8:26 p.m. when no one offered further comment.

Commissioner concerns included the *effect of not passing the proposed amendment, project scheduling, timing of financial projections, financing the proposed move of City Hall, how tax increment financing works, impact on individual taxpayers, and whether affected properties can "opt out."*

Ms. Richards assured Commissioners that the City is complying with statutory requirements to gain the support of all affected taxing districts before adopting the proposed amendment.

**Motion 2** (5/0/0): Commissioner Bleile moved to recommend that City Council adopt the proposed 12<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Redmond Downtown Urban Renewal Plan as presented. Commissioner Nastari seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Chair Porter closed the public hearing at 8:50 p.m.

After a short break, Chair Porter reopened the Planning Commission meeting at 8:56 p.m.

#### **V. WORKSHOP – Retail Uses and Home Occupations in Redmond’s Residential Zones**

Ms. Richards presented her staff report (Exhibit 3) which included a table listing the uses allowed outright or conditionally within residential zones. Based on research of how other communities handle these concerns, she said improvements were needed in the home occupation application process. City Council has requested that the Planning Commission review the “home occupation” code to assure that residential zones are adequately protected from retail activities.

Chair Porter invited public comment on this issue:

- \* Don Fields said he brought this issue before City Council because he was concerned about traffic, parking, signage, and noise impacts caused by a neighbor’s wine-tasting/wine-selling activity in his residential neighborhood. He became aware of this activity when he learned that approval of an Oregon Liquor Control Commission application was pending. He read aloud his letter to OLCC and his letter to City Councilor Ed Boero.
- \* Susan Nobles expressed concern about limiting employment options and the City’s enforcement policy for private property uses. Home occupations are a cost-effective way for Redmond residents to start small businesses, support their families, and contribute to their community’s prosperity.

Commissioner discussion points included the *role of City police in OLCC applications, differences between “home occupation” and “retail sales,” vehicle trips per day, hours of operation, traffic safety, and implementing a permit revocation procedure.*

**By consensus,** Commissioners recommended discussing this issue further before recommending any action to City Council.

**II. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS**

Ms. Dawson commended Mr. Williams for the thoroughness of his presentation during the hearing on the proposed 12<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Redmond's downtown urban renewal district.

**VI. STAFF COMMENTS** (None)

**VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS** (None)

**VIII. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AND SIGNED BY ME  
THIS 19th DAY OF April, 2011.

ATTEST:

/s/ Eric Porter

Eric Porter, Chair