



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

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes

Monday, July 5, 2011

City Council Chambers, 777 SW Deschutes Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Eric Porter, Vice Chair Will Van Vactor, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, Stan Clark, Katie McDonald, John Nastari

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON: Margie Dawson

CITY STAFF: Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; James Lewis, *Long-Range Planner*; 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 7:02 p.m. with a quorum present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

III. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Mixed Use Live/Work Zone, TA 11-02 and TA 11-01

Chair Porter did not read the hearing procedures, stating that was part of the record from June 7, 2011. He re-opened the hearing at 7:04 p.m. to receive additional public testimony.

- * John Schimmoller (proponent) said that allowing offices, either outright or as part of a live/work unit, would jumpstart redevelopment in this area, benefiting both himself and the City. He would prefer freestanding offices. Lot sizes will impose a natural size limit, but 2,500 square feet would be more than adequate.
- * Utah Sullens (opponent) reiterated his concerns about traffic congestion (especially on Jackson), street safety, crime, and on-street parking which would be worse if businesses were allowed to build in his neighborhood. Mr. Schimmoller is a nonresident, so he would not have to deal with the negative impacts.
- * Keith MacNamara (opponent) said he has lived here for 15 years. Current businesses generate traffic and encourage speeding in the neighborhood, and this would only get worse with more businesses.

- * Annette Midget (opponent) said that she was a former Planning Commissioner. The same problems being reported now, such as traffic congestion, existed 10 years ago. Changing the R-4 zone will make it harder for homeowners to sell, finance, or insure their properties and will drive property values down. Home businesses are allowed in the R-4 zone now, so why is a change needed? Redevelop vacant industrial parcels before zoning new industrial land. Allowing offices will not upgrade this good neighborhood.
- * Doris Everhart (opponent) said her primary concerns were safety for kids and pets and higher property taxes. The R4-zoned neighborhood is a good place to live.
- * Bill Hedegaard (opponent) presented a petition signed by 28 residents of Casper Mobile Estates who oppose this zone change. The Planning Commission broke the promise it made 10 years ago to leave their neighborhood alone. The senior citizens living here have a lot of pride in their neighborhood and want to keep its character. Lots here are too small for business development. Allowing commercial uses in the R4 zone will discourage new residential development and increase traffic volumes. Why weren't R4 residents invited to participate on the committees that developed this proposal?
- * Donald Keith (opponent) asked why the R4 area can't stay "as is."

Chair Porter closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m., thanked everyone for their testimony, and requested a staff report.

Mr. Lewis summarized the review process to date (Exhibit 1, July 5 memo) and discussed the results of staff research into Measure 49 impacts, original zoning, and Planning Commission minutes from the late 1990s through 2000. Commissioner Clark's proposed changes should be incorporated into the draft code text as they eliminate ambiguity without changing the intent.

Commissioner discussion points covered *impacts of home businesses (noise, traffic) on neighborhoods, input from home insurance agents and lenders, impact of a residential "island" on traffic patterns, protecting current residential uses by leaving the R4 area "as is," honoring oral commitments from 10 years ago, rationale for excluding duplexes and triplexes, compatibility with existing uses, traffic control measures, rationale for the original zone change, impact to property values, clarity of vision, impact of exempting the R4 area from the proposed zone change, lot size determining type and size of business, requiring a conditional-use permit for live/work units, allowing offices up to 2,500 square feet if on-site parking is required, and redevelopment timeline.*

Chair Porter re-opened the hearing at 8:25 p.m. to receive public testimony on live/work units.

- * Annette Midget (opponent) expressed concern about the type of businesses that would be allowed and east-west access connections.

Chair Porter again closed the hearing to further public testimony at 8:33 p.m.

Motion 1 (4/3/0): Commissioner McDonald moved that Planning Commission recommend that City Council adopt the current ordinance which does not allow standalone offices and remove the R4 area (Casper Acres). Commissioner Clark seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Bleile, Clark, McDonald, and Nastari voting in favor and Commissioners Allman, Porter, and Van Vactor voting in opposition.

Commissioners and staff thanked the citizens for their participation.

Chair Porter called a five-minute recess, reconvening the meeting at 8:45 p.m. without Commissioner McDonald.

IV. WORK SESSION

A. Wireless and Broadcast Communications Facilities

Mr. Lewis outlined the proposed regulations (Exhibit 2, July 5 memo). The intent is to respond to community concerns (location, size, and design of facilities), define the desirable types, update the code to conform with current legal requirements, ensure new facilities are aesthetically compatible with minimal effect on property values, protect citizens from adverse impacts of using the latest technology, and streamline the review process.

Ms. Richards said several facilities have indicated interest in this issue.

Commissioner concerns included *height limits in residential zones, facility maintenance, abandoned facilities, defining micro-cell and macro-cell facilities, and approval criteria.*

By consensus, Commissioner requested a work session on July 19 to allow more in-depth review of the proposed new regulations.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion 2 (1/0/1): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the June 7, 2011, minutes as presented. Commissioner Nastari seconded the motion which failed due to lack of votes with Commissioner Porter voting in favor and Commissioner Clark abstaining.

Motion 3 (4/0/2): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the June 7, 2011, minutes as presented. Commissioner Bleile seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman, Bleile, Nastari, and Porter voting in favor and Commissioners Clark and Van Vactor abstaining.

VI. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

Upcoming meetings

* July 19: communication facility code update & Dry Canyon Master Plan

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Clark said he would stay to support Commissioner Bleile's code update project.

Commissioner Nastari tendered his resignation for personal reasons effective immediately. He has enjoyed the opportunity to serve the citizens of Redmond and stated that the future of the City was in very good hands.

IX. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 9:13 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AND SIGNED BY ME
THIS 8th DAY OF September, 2011.

ATTEST:

/s/ Eric Porter
Eric Porter, Chair