



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Ave.
Redmond, OR 97756

(P) 541-923-7721
(F) 541-548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

City Hall – Conference Room A
716 SW Evergreen Avenue

Tuesday, January 17, 2012,
6:30 PM

Agenda

UAPC
Members

Eric Porter,
Chair

Will
Van Vactor,
Vice Chair

Tory
Allman

Bob
Bleile

Stan
Clark

Anne
Graham

Katie
McDonald

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. CITIZEN COMMENTS**
- III. FIRST MEETING OF THE YEAR BUSINESS**
 - a. Introduction / Swearing-In of New Commissioners**
 - b. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair positions**
- IV. WORK SESSION –**
 - a. Proposed Development Code Amendments, Section 8.3035(4)(E) – Site and Design Review Standards for Multi-family Dwellings, Complexes-Amendments (Exhibit 1)**
 - b. Discussion of 2012 Work Plan. (Exhibit 2)**
- V. COUNCIL LIASON COMMENTS (if present)**
- VI. Approval of Minutes:**
 - a. October 4, 2011 (Exhibit 3)**
 - b. October 18, 2011 (Exhibit 4)**
 - c. December 20, 2011 (Exhibit 5)**
- VII. STAFF COMMENTS**
- VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- IX. ADJOURN**

*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 Mike Viegas, ADA Coordinator, at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at (541) 504-3032, 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.



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756
(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

EXHIBIT 1

DATE: January 17, 2012
TO: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
FROM: James J. Lewis, Senior Planner, Long Range/Economic Planning
SUBJECT: Amendment to the Text of the Redmond Development Code – Site and Design Review Standards for Multi-Family Dwellings and Complexes - Work Session

Report in Brief:

This is a second work session to discuss proposed development code amendments to Section 8.3035 (4)(E) of the Redmond City Code, Site and Design Review Standards, for Multi-Family Dwellings and Complexes. The changes being considered primarily include the existing requirements for: setbacks and required yards; distances between buildings; and, general design guidelines.

Two attachments have been provided as a reference:

Attachment A shows proposed changes and additions to the existing code. Since staff is recommending reorganizing the sequence of code elements, Attachment B has been provided as a clean copy of the proposed code in entirety without tracking changes to the existing code for clarity.

Background:

The Development Code requirements for multi-family dwellings and complexes include specific dimensional requirements for separation between individual buildings, and buildings and the adjoining development on adjacent lots, which are based on the overall height and number of stories that are proposed for individual buildings. The intent of the requirements is to mitigate the potential impacts of the massing and scale of multi-family buildings, with the resulting development providing a degree of architectural compatibility (i.e. good design), and opportunities for privacy and open space for residents of the proposed development and on adjoining lots.

Recent proposals for multi-family development have shown that the intent of the standards as described above (intended for public benefit) have proven challenging with regard to efficient use of land and meeting intended densities. Prospective developers have indicated that even though the intent of the requirements is valid, the standards as written make such development impractical as it results in an inefficient use of land and does not allow necessary densities to be met. Thus, the multi-family development projects approved over the past few years have included variances to the development standards in one form or another to provide the intended mitigation while also allowing for practical development patterns. The requirements creating the most difficulty include:

Attachments: Attachment A – Proposed changes to the existing code – tracking additions, deletions and restructuring
Attachment B – Proposed draft code

- Requirement for second and third story setbacks of 25 feet from adjoining single-family residential lots (greater than 15 feet required for the first floor);
- Requirements for second, third and fourth stories to be no more than 80% of the building footprint with a 4 foot setback from the vertical plane of the first floor; and,
- Requirement for a separation between buildings equal to one half of the sum of the height of both buildings.
- Minimum open space requirements that do not include any provisions for design to ensure that the area is “useable.”

Although the overall mass and scale of the individual structures is reduced when employing the requirements strictly as written, the resulting development is not necessarily architecturally interesting or attractive. Rather, the prescriptive design requirements can result in static architectural patterns in the community. The combination of the building separation requirements, the upper floor setback distances and floor size restrictions, result in designs that have an inefficient use of land and does not necessarily provide useable open space. Thus, these arbitrary standards do not result in attractive designs for the community and ultimately prevent many projects from being economically feasible.

The past development approvals, with variances to the standards as written, have allowed the City to maintain the original intent of the standards to achieve good design and mitigation of potential development impacts, while also allowing for efficient use of land and meeting desired densities. However, the permitting process (with the variance process included) is cumbersome and is responsive to proposed designs rather than streamlined and affirmative in the intent. The result is an unpredictable development pattern for both the City, the residents and the property owners.

At the Planning Commission meeting on December 20th, 2011, the specific issues listed above were discussed. The Planning Commission understood the intent of the provisions, but also realized the practical difficulties encountered by staff and prospective developers when applying them to a particular site. Staff conveyed to the Planning Commission the idea of revising the standards to achieve the same overall intent, but to minimize the practical difficulties that have been encountered. The Planning Commission directed staff to prepare a draft of potential Development Code amendments and bring it back to subsequent work sessions for further discussion.

Discussion:

The attached draft amendments would be included in the Site and Design Review section of the Development Code. They are intended to replace the existing standards – copies of the existing Development Code standards and the proposed draft amendments are attached. However, this does not mean that all provision of the existing code are proposed to be eliminated. Some provisions were retained and reworded, and incorporated into the draft document.

Primary Amendments – The primary amendments include:

Eliminating the requirements for:

- Second and third story setbacks of 25 feet from adjoining single-family residential lots; and,
- Separation between buildings equal to one half of the sum of the height of both buildings.

Altering the requirements for:

- Vehicular and bicycle parking
- Trash and mechanical area design, storage areas and common open space – adding specificity; and;
- Special yards

Adding new requirements for:

- Building orientation (primary entrances) toward the public street or common area;
- Recesses/extensions/offsets along continuous building elevations at specific distances;
- Doors, porches, balconies or windows (openings in walls) along building elevations visible from public rights of way;
- Multiple architectural features added to all building elevations;
- Specificity regarding exterior building finishes and materials; and,
- Private open space design.

The amendments are intended to rectify the difficulties in administering the code as described above. Further, they are intended to provide more affirmative action toward the designs the City of Redmond desires with multi-family development rather than being reactive in its approach. The intent is to still minimize the adverse impacts of mass and scale, but doing so in a more architecturally complete manner that also allows flexibility to the developer. The resulting development will be compatible with existing single family and multi-family development in the R4 and R5 zones, will provide a more efficient use of land, and a more viable and livable product for the developer, the future residents and the community in general.

Reformatting of Code – The existing multi-family development standards are included in multiple sections of the Development Code (Off-Street Parking and Loading section, Site and Design Review section, Residential Use Zone section). Thus, the format is awkward to use in that the references to multiple sections provides opportunity to overlook various development requirements. The attached draft code incorporates these multiple section requirements into this sole subsection for ease of use.

Water/Sewer Standards for Multi-family Development – For multi-family dwellings and complexes (multiple buildings with multiple units) on one lot, the current City of Redmond policies require that: the property have one master water meter with service lines to each building; or, each building have its own water meter with service lines to each unit. Because neither the buildings nor individual units can be bought or sold individually, there is no risk of the sale of individual units affecting the service and billing status of other buildings/units on the same site.

For multi-family structures with common walls but having individual units on individual properties (such as townhomes or zero-lot line developments), each unit/property must have its own water meter. Although there is some historic development in Redmond that is not developed this way (Fairhaven Vista), this is the current City policy. This allows each unit/property to be served/billed in the same manner as a single family residence and allows units to be bought and sold individually without affecting the water service of other units. Thus, each unit/property is responsible for its own service/bill.

Individual sewer service to each dwelling unit is required for multi-family units/buildings on the same lot, although individual dwelling unit service lines may be collected into a single line extending from the lot to the main in the public right of way. For townhome and common wall zero lot line development on individual lots, a separate sewer service line from each unit to the sewer main is required.

Home Owners Associations/CCR's – Homeowners associations (HOA's), are required for all residential developments where there is common area that is created separate from individual lot/unit ownership (common area as a separate legal lot). Thus, the common area is under collective (common) ownership by the overall owners of the individual lots/units within the development. This includes: planned unit developments; zero lot line developments; and, condominiums. The HOA's are responsible for administering the covenants, conditions and restrictions (CCR's), and by-laws created as governing documents for the development, on behalf of the collective ownership. This typically includes: collection of fees for operations/general administration; enforcing CCR's; and upkeep/maintenance of common areas/facilities. Within these broad categories of responsibility, there

are many specific tasks, such as: landscaping maintenance; road maintenance; provision of utilities; architectural review and enforcement; etc. However, the responsibilities can vary depending on the type of development and specific amenities provided.

The CCR's and by-laws for residential developments that are administered by HOA's are typically separate from any zoning/development requirements of a municipal agency. The CCR's/by-laws are self imposed requirements that go "over and above" or, are "in addition to" the requirements of the public agency. Thus, the agency does not have any responsibility or obligation for enforcement of the CCR's/by-laws. Again, such enforcement is through the HOA or through other private means.

Notwithstanding the private administration and enforcement of CCR's, a public agency such as the City of Redmond can be given enforcement authority within the by-laws that stipulate administrative responsibility. Although such authority is not typically given by the private entity, nor accepted by the public agency, a local government such as the City of Redmond is not legally prevented from participating. Such participation would require legal documents (contracts) stipulating the responsibilities, obligations and authority of each party.

The involvement of the City in private CCR's is a delicate issue on the basis of legal and fiscal responsibility of the City for enforcement, and policy direction of the City that may be different than the CCR's/by-laws. Additionally, questions about the physical and fiscal responsibilities regarding the City's obligation for development and maintenance of common features are important to address. Where a HOA has been established, the involvement of the City in administration of CCR's and by-laws creates parallel "governmental" agencies. In such a case, the legal documents must clearly define the roles of the parties.

Staff believes that if the City of Redmond development requirements and policies governing the provision of public services are clear, the responsibilities of the public versus private entities will be distinct. Thus, the inherent protections provided by the separate public and private requirements (the Development Code versus CCR's) will ensure that the basic livability and viability of the development are maintained according to the individual responsibilities of each entity (the City versus the HOA). As a result, the entry of the City into the administrative duties of the private CCR's is not typically necessary nor desirable.

Economic Viability of Multi-family Development Types – There was discussion at the last Planning Commission meeting regarding directing the type of multi-family development toward apartment complex type development (multiple, multi-unit buildings on a single lot) rather than townhome or zero-lot line development (attached/common wall individual units on separate legal lots). Some of the rationale for this discussion had to do with the aforementioned problems that the water service/metering for some existing townhome/zero lot line development in Redmond has caused – a past development of this type was allowed to use a master meter for a zero lot line development where properties/units could be sold individually. As stated above, this is not the current City of Redmond policy. Nonetheless, the past practice of allowing water service/metering in this manner has caused difficulty in maintaining water service for the development (when there are empty units) and has caused difficulty in selling the units for the same reason. Because multi-family building/units on the same lot do not allow individual unit sales, the water service/metering policy for a master meter does not cause the same problem.

The current policy requiring separate service lines/meters for each individual legal lot (including attached/common wall multi-family units/buildings – townhome/zero lot line development), the problem caused by the past policy of allowing master meters for this type of development will not occur. Therefore, staff believes that directing multi-family development toward a single style (apartment complex) is not necessary. Rather, the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code regulations (for all residential development) are intended to encourage a variety of housing types, with a variety of

densities and designs. Typically, market desires for housing types within the community will determine the type of residential development that will ultimately be built. By allowing a variety of housing types, the development pattern within the community remains vibrant and the full spectrum of housing needs (i.e. affordable housing to upper end homes) can be provided according to market demand. Thus, staff believes that the housing types allowed within the various Residential zones are appropriate as long as the development regulations (including the provision of water/sewer service) do not cause underlying problems affecting the economic viability and livability of any individual multi-family development project.

Planning Commission Direction – Staff is seeking direction from the Planning Commission regarding the proposed draft amendments, as compared to the existing Development Code standards. Through discussion of various development scenarios, with graphic representations/examples provided at the meeting, Staff is desirous of moving forward with refining new code text which eliminates the current problems and directs (in a positive manner) the type of development that will be beneficial to the community.

Alternative Courses of Action:

Continue to work with Staff to revise the draft text through work sessions while also beginning the public involvement process (establishing a public review timeline, public and agency notice).

Recommendation/Suggested Motion:

Not applicable.

James J. Lewis, Senior Planner, Long Range/Economic Planning

Attachment A:

Article IV, Site and Design Review Standards – Development Code Amendments: Multi Family Dwellings and Complexes (Section 8.3035(4)(E))

Development Code Amendments (new text is **red**; deleted text is ~~strikethrough~~, unless otherwise stated):

8.3035 Design Review Criteria. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following applicable criteria shall be met.

1. Installation of Utilities. All new service lines and relocated transmission lines shall be placed underground. Existing overhead transmission lines or utility lines shall be relocated underground unless otherwise approved by the CDD Director, City Engineer, or Hearings Body.
2. Right-of-Way Dedication & Public Improvements. Adequate right-of-way dedication and improvements to streets, alleys, sidewalks, bikeways and other public ways shall be provided by the Owner that conform to City of Redmond adopted Transportation Plan, Transportation Impact Analysis & Access Management Standards, Public Works Standards & Specification and the local service street policies, including the grid policy. In lieu of actual construction of improvements, the City may choose to accept financial payment, contribution, other approved security or agreement for the purpose of providing the needed improvements. The City may require that no building permit be issued until public improvements are completed; this shall be clearly identified (if applicable) within the Site Improvement Agreement.
3. Neighborhood Compatibility. This standard shall not apply to any development that also requires a conditional use permit;
 - A. The proposal will be consistent with applicable zoning standards.
 - B. The location, size, design, and physical characteristics of the proposal (such as setbacks, height, position of structure on the site) will have minimal adverse impact on the livability or value of abutting properties.
 - C. The project will not exceed the operational capacity of public facilities and which are required to serve the development unless the City Engineer determines that sufficient capacity can be provided. The capacity of public facilities and services shall be based primarily on the City's Water and Wastewater Master Plan and the Transportation System Plan.
4. Architectural Requirements.
 - A. Architectural theme. A specific architectural theme is required for any structure that is a candidate for Site and Design review. The theme used shall be carried out completely in the design and not mixed with conflicting themes. The theme used shall be consistent with all buildings on the subject site.
 - B. False front design. A false front design of a building shall be avoided, except for the Downtown (C-2) Commercial District.
 - C. Historical Buildings. Compliance with the preservation of historic buildings and sites pursuant to section 8.0855 and 8.0860 where applicable.
 - D. Commercial buildings.
 1. Commercial Building Orientation. The City may require the applicant to position commercial buildings to have their architectural orientation toward the primary focal point on the site (typically the higher ordered street). However, the City may also require the applicant to orient the

building in any position on the site if the perceived focal point is internal to the site. At no time shall unbroken spans of side or rear walls of buildings be visible from any street without architectural treatments and screening added. Orientation of the building shall consider compatibility with neighboring structures in terms of setbacks, height of building, architectural treatment, and entrances of neighboring buildings.

2. Commercial buildings shall comply with the City’s access policies regarding vehicle access and provide adequate pedestrian ways to safely navigate the parking areas and to connect to the public sidewalks. Adequate internal vehicle access shall be designed to minimize or eliminate vehicle/vehicle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.
3. Drive-up windows and drive-throughs should be oriented away from the principle street.

E. Multi-Family Dwellings and Complexes.

~~1. There shall be no window-to-adjoining-window alignment when adjoining buildings are less than 60' apart.~~

~~(Note: Relocated to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(8))~~

1. **Density Standards.** The following residential densities shall apply to multi-family dwellings and complexes:

- a. **General Residential (R4) Zone** – A minimum of 4.0 units per acre and a maximum of 14.5 units per acre.
- b. **High density residential (R5) Zone** – A minimum of 8.0 units per acre and a maximum of 17.4 units per acre.

~~2. Unbroken or continuous building spans greater than 32' in length (including roof lines) are not permitted. At least three architectural features shall be added to buildings more than 32' in length. Choices of these required features include (but are not limited to) oriel or bay windows, trellises, staggered roof heights or pitches, cupolas, decorative trim, and stone or brick embellishments. The developer may choose a different architectural feature subject to the approval by the Community Development Director.~~

2. **Table A. Minimum Standards.** The following minimum standards apply in each of the Residential zones as follows.

Standard:	R-4	R-5
Minimum Lot size - Square Feet		
Multi-family Dwelling	7,500/2 units	7,500/2 units
add per unit	1,250	1,250
Multi-family Complex	7,500+	7,500+
Studio add per additional unit	750	250
1 Bedroom add per add'l unit	1,000	500
2 Bedroom add per add'l unit	1,500	1,000
3 Bedroom add per add'l unit	2,250	1,550
4 Bedroom add per add'l unit	2,500	1,850
Maximum Density (1 unit per # s.f.)	3,000	2,500
Minimum Setback Distance ^(A)		
Front	15	15

Side	15	15
Rear	20	15
Garage	20	20
Maximum Building Height	40	40
Off Street Parking		
Multi-Family Dwelling (3 & 4 D.U.'s)	2 sp. / D.U.	2 sp. / D.U.
Multi-Family Complex (over 4 D.U.'s)	2 sp. / D.U. + 1 sp. / Mgr. + 1 sp. / 5 D.U.'s	2 sp. / D.U. + 1 sp. / Mgr. + 1 sp. / 5 D.U.'s

(A) Does not include solar setbacks which are calculated separately

~~3. Lining up two or more residential buildings in even rows is prohibited. Buildings shall be located so they enclose spaces and so that views from within buildings are oriented to landscaped courts or recreation areas wherever feasible.~~

3. **Building Orientation.** All buildings facing a public street right of way shall have a primary entrance oriented to the public street. Additional primary entrances, if provided, or, in cases where buildings are internal to the development and do not front on the public street right of way, shall be oriented to a private common area (common areas include: private streets, courtyards or open spaces). A hard surfaced pedestrian sidewalk or pathway connecting the building entrances to the public street right of way shall be provided.

~~4. There shall be no outdoor storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the complex. All multifamily developments shall provide for storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the complex. Each dwelling shall have its own storage area, which shall be securable. Storage areas may be indoor such as attached or detached garages, or within specific areas that are internal to each dwelling unit. Storage areas may also be within outdoor structures such as within a carport or a separate storage building on premises. The City may exempt or reduce the storage space requirement for "specialty housing" such as housing for the elderly or for housing for long-term infirm care. (Note: Relocated and rewritten to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(15))~~

4. **Building Form.** The continuous horizontal distance (i.e., as measured from end-wall to end-wall) of individual buildings (including buildings with multiple dwelling units) shall not exceed 90 lineal feet, unless part of a Master Plan development which may permit a maximum length of 120 feet. All building elevations shall incorporate design features such as offsets, extensions, balconies, doors, porches, window reveals, or similar elements to preclude large expanses of uninterrupted building surfaces. Along all elevations of the structure, such features shall occur at a minimum of every 30 lineal feet, and each floor shall contain at least two of the following features or. A minimum of 40% of the street

facing elevation and a minimum of 30% of side and rear building elevations shall contain at least two of the following features (percent of elevation is measured as the horizontal plane in lineal feet containing such design features:

- a. Recess (e.g., deck, patio, courtyard, entrance or similar feature) that has a minimum depth of 4 feet;
- b. Extension (e.g., floor area, deck, patio, entrance or similar feature) that projects a minimum of 2 feet and runs horizontally for a minimum length of 4 feet; and/or
- c. Offsets or breaks in roof elevation of 2 feet or greater in height.
- d. All building elevations visible from a public street right-of-way shall provide doors, porches, balconies, and/or windows. The standard applies to each full and partial building story.

~~5. All roadways and parking areas shall be paved and roadways shall not be less than 20 feet in width.~~

5. Detailed Architectural Features. All buildings shall provide detailed design along all elevations (e.g., front, rear and sides). Detailed design requires use of at least five of the following architectural features on all front and exterior side (corner lot) elevations and at least three of the following architectural features on all interior and rear yard elevations, at a minimum of every 30 lineal feet of horizontal wall or portion thereof. Architectural features shall be varied on the different building elevations. The standard applies to each full and partial building story.

- a. Dormers
- b. Gables
- c. Recessed entries
- d. Covered porch entries
- e. Cupolas or towers
- f. Pillars or posts
- g. Eaves (minimum 6-inch projection)
- h. Off-sets in building face or roof (minimum 16 inches)
- i. Window trim on all windows on the facade
- j. Bay or oriel windows
- k. Balconies
- l. Decorative patterns on exterior finishes (e.g., scales/shingles, wainscoting, ornamentation, and similar features)
- m. Decorative cornices and roof lines (e.g., for flat roofs)
- n. An alternative feature providing visual relief and detail, similar to options a-m above, may be approved through the development review process.

~~6. No parking shall be permitted on any common or shared driveways or private drives less than 28' in width.~~

(Note: Relocated and rewritten to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(16))

6. Exterior Finish. The exterior finish on all vertical surfaces shall be comprised primarily of materials such as masonry/wood lap siding, shingles, brick or stucco. The use of sheet metal, plywood, T1-11 siding, smooth face cinder block and other similar materials is not

permitted. Textured cinder blocks may be permitted on side and rear facades, but shall not exceed 40% of the total exterior wall area of the ground/bottom floor.

~~7. All second or third stories of any multiple family dwelling or complex shall be setback 25 feet from the property line of an abutting single family or duplex residential dwelling or lot. Single story multiple family dwellings or complexes shall be set back no less than 15 feet from the property line of an abutting single family or duplex residential dwelling or lot. The Hearings Body may approve setbacks adjacent to single family or duplex residential dwellings or lots to be reduced to the minimum yard setback allowed in the zone if the design mitigates impacts to adjacent properties.~~

7. Building Mass and Scale. Third and fourth stories of multifamily dwellings and complexes, and/or all portions of the structure above 20 feet in height, in residential zones shall occupy no more than 80% of the building footprint area (ground floor), and shall have walls set back no less than 4 feet from the continuous vertical plane created by the walls of the first floor, excluding design and architectural features such as recessions, extensions (i.e. decks, covered entries, windows, doors).
(Note: Relocated from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(10))

~~8. All new multifamily dwellings and complexes shall be set back no less than 15' (fifteen feet) from any adjacent residential dwelling or use as measured from the property line to the foundation of the new building. A sight obscuring fence or evergreen hedge may be required by the Hearings Body when in its judgment such screening is necessary to preserve the values of nearby properties, protect the aesthetic character of the neighborhood or vicinity, and to provide security for occupants of the subject complex.~~
(Note: Relocated from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(14))

8. Building Alignment. There shall be no window to adjoining window alignment when adjacent buildings are less than 30 feet apart.
(Note: Relocated from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(1))

~~9. Covered bicycle parking facilities shall be provided.~~
(Note: Relocated and rewritten to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(17))

9. Trash Receptacles. A common trash enclosure shall be required and is subject to the following standards.
- a. Trash enclosures shall be oriented away from adjacent residences and shall be screened.
 - b. Trash enclosures shall be accessible to trash pick-up vehicles.
 - c. Trash enclosures, a minimum of six-feet in height, shall be constructed of solid, durable and attractive walls, with solid screen doors and shall be visually consistent with project architecture.
 - d. A minimum two (2) foot irrigated and landscaped perimeter shall be provided around the enclosure (excepting door entries).

- e. Enclosure areas shall contain sufficient space to accommodate both waste disposal and recycling containers adequate to accommodate the degree of development. Documentation from the applicable trash collection company shall indicate that the area and type of container(s) will be adequate to accommodate the amount of refuse that is anticipated to be generated on an ordinary basis.
- ~~10. Second, third and fourth stories of multifamily dwellings and complexes in residential zones shall occupy no more than 80% of the building footprint area (ground floor), and shall be set back no less than 4 feet from the vertical plane created by the first floor.
(Note: Relocated to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(7))~~
10. Mechanical Equipment. External mechanical equipment, such as heating or cooling equipment, pumps or generators, that is located on the ground or on the roof of buildings, must be entirely screened from view by sight obscuring walls, fences, parapets or other similar means consistent with the overall architecture of the development. Landscaping is not an acceptable alternative for such screening as specified herein. Screening shall be compliant with all applicable fire codes.
- ~~11. Special yards and distances between new multi family dwelling / complex buildings on a site when multiple buildings are proposed, or which will be adjacent to existing buildings having setbacks less than 10 feet from their respective property lines, shall be provided as follows:~~
- a. ~~An inner court providing access to double row dwelling groups shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width.
(Note: Relocated to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(13))~~
 - b. ~~Except for single family dwellings on one lot, the distance between principal buildings shall be at least one half the sum of the height of both buildings; provided, however, that in no case shall the distance be less than 12 feet. This requirement shall also apply to portions of the same buildings separated from each other by a court or other open space.~~
11. Common Open Space. A minimum of 15 percent of site area (inclusive of required setbacks but exclusive of dedicated street rights-of-way and land dedicated to other public uses like parks and schools), shall be provided as common open space and be suitable for a recreational play area, or group or community activities. However, in no case shall less than 3,000 square feet of common open space be provided. Such area shall be improved with grass, plantings, surfacing, equipment or buildings suitable for recreational use. The Hearings Body may require this area to be protected from streets, parking areas, or the like, by a fence or the equivalent. Sensitive lands and historic buildings or landmarks open to the public and designated by the Comprehensive Plan may be counted toward meeting the common open space requirements.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(13))

- ~~12. Multi family dwellings and complexes shall comply with the City's access policies regarding vehicle access and provide adequate pedestrian ways to safely navigate the parking areas and to connect to the public sidewalks. Adequate internal vehicle access shall be designed to minimize or eliminate vehicle/vehicle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.~~

~~*(Note: Relocated and rewritten to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(16))*~~

12. Private Open Space. Private open space shall be required for all multi-family units based on the following standards:
- Ground/bottom floor housing units shall have front or rear patios or decks at least 4 feet deep and measuring at least 48 square feet in area.
 - A minimum of 50% of all upper floor (second floor and above) housing units shall have balconies or porches at least 4 feet deep and measuring at least 48 square feet in area.
 - To the maximum extent possible, private open space areas shall be oriented toward common open space areas and away from adjacent single family residences, parking areas and driveways and trash enclosures.

- ~~13. For a multi-family dwelling complex a minimum of at least 2,500 square feet plus 150 square feet per dwelling unit shall be provided for a recreational play area, group or community activities, or common open space. Such area shall be improved with grass, plantings, surfacing, equipment or buildings suitable for recreational use. The Hearings Body may require this area to be protected from streets, parking areas, or the like, by a fence or the equivalent.~~

~~*(Note: Relocated and rewritten to Section 8.3035(4)(E)(11))*~~

13. Special Yards. In order to allow air circulation and light, the distance between buildings on the same lot shall be as follows:
- An inner court providing access to double-row dwelling groups shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width.
 - The distance between principal buildings on the same lot shall be no less than 12 feet.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(11))

14. Special Fencing/Landscaping. A sight obscuring fence or evergreen hedge may be required by the Hearings Body when, in its judgment, such screening is necessary to preserve the values of nearby properties, protect the aesthetic character of the neighborhood or vicinity, and to provide security for occupants of the subject complex.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(8))

15. Storage. There shall be no outdoor storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the complex. All multifamily dwellings and complexes shall provide for storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the

complex. Each dwelling unit shall have its one assigned storage area, which is a minimum 18 square feet, and shall be securable. Storage areas may be indoor, such as attached or detached garages, or within specific areas that are internal to each dwelling unit. Storage areas may also be within outdoor structures such as within a separate storage building on premises. The City may exempt or reduce the storage space requirement for “specialty housing” such as housing for the elderly or for housing for long-term infirm care.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(4))

16. Off-Street Parking. The number of off street parking spaces shall be provided in conformance with Section 8.0500 through 8.0515 of the City of Redmond Code. Multi-family dwellings and complexes shall comply with the City’s access policies regarding vehicle access and provide adequate pedestrian ways to safely navigate the parking areas and to connect to the public sidewalks. Adequate internal vehicle access shall be designed to minimize or eliminate vehicle/vehicle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. Off-street parking areas shall not be placed between the primary building elevations and public streets. Parallel parking shall not be permitted on any common or shared driveways or private drives less than 28’ in width.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(6) and (12))

17. Bicycle Parking. One (1) covered bicycle parking space shall be provided for every two (2) dwelling units. Covered bicycle parking spaces may be located within a garage, storage shed, basement or similar area, provided the area is not otherwise obstructed with mechanical equipment. In those instances where there is no garage or other easily accessible storage area, the bicycles shall be sheltered from sun precipitation by an independent structure specifically designed for such. Covered bicycle parking areas shall be evenly distributed throughout the development. The City may exempt or reduce the covered bicycle parking space requirement for “specialty housing” such as housing for the elderly or for housing for long-term infirm care.

(Note: Relocated and rewritten from Section 8.3035(4)(E)(9))

Attachment B:

**Article IV, Site and Design Review Standards – Development Code Amendments:
Multi Family Dwellings and Complexes (Section 8.3035(4)(E))**

8.3035 Design Review Criteria. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following applicable criteria shall be met.

E. Multi-Family Dwellings and Complexes.

1. Density Standards. The following residential densities shall apply to multi-family dwellings and complexes:

- a. General Residential (R4) Zone – A minimum of 4.0 units per acre and a maximum of 14.5 units per acre.
- b. High density residential (R5) Zone – A minimum of 8.0 units per acre and a maximum of 17.4 units per acre.

2. Table A. Minimum Standards. The following minimum standards apply in each of the Residential zones as follows.

Standard:	R-4	R-5
Minimum Lot size - Square Feet		
Multi-family Dwelling	7,500/2 units	7,500/2 units
add per unit	1,250	1,250
Multi-family Complex	7,500+	7,500+
Studio add per additional unit	750	250
1 Bedroom add per add'l unit	1,000	500
2 Bedroom add per add'l unit	1,500	1,000
3 Bedroom add per add'l unit	2,250	1,550
4 Bedroom add per add'l unit	2,500	1,850
Maximum Density (1 unit per # s.f.)	3,000	2,500
Minimum Setback Distance ^(A)		
Front	15	15
Side	15	15
Rear	20	15
Garage	20	20
Maximum Building Height	40	40
Off Street Parking		
Multi-Family Dwelling (3 & 4 D.U.'s)	2 sp. / D.U.	2 sp. / D.U.
	2 sp. / D.U. + 1 sp. / Mgr. +	2 sp. / D.U. + 1 sp. / Mgr. +
Multi-Family Complex (over 4 D.U.'s)	1 sp. / 5 D.U.'s	1 sp. / 5 D.U.'s

(A) Does not include solar setbacks which are calculated separately

3. Building Orientation. All buildings facing a public street right of way shall have a primary entrance oriented to the public street. Additional primary entrances, if provided, or, in cases where buildings are internal

to the development and do not front on the public street right of way, shall be oriented to a private common area (common areas include: private streets, courtyards or open spaces). A hard surfaced pedestrian sidewalk or pathway connecting the building entrances to the public street right of way shall be provided.

4. **Building Form.** The continuous horizontal distance (i.e., as measured from end-wall to end-wall) of individual buildings (including buildings with multiple dwelling units) shall not exceed 90 lineal feet, unless part of a Master Plan development which may permit a maximum length of 120 feet. All building elevations shall incorporate design features such as offsets, extensions, balconies, doors, porches, window reveals, or similar elements to preclude large expanses of uninterrupted building surfaces. Along all elevations of the structure, such features shall occur at a minimum of every 30 lineal feet, and each floor shall contain at least two of the following features or. A minimum of 40% of the street facing elevation and a minimum of 30% of side and rear building elevations shall contain at least two of the following features (percent of elevation is measured as the horizontal plane in lineal feet containing such design features:
 - a. Recess (e.g., deck, patio, courtyard, entrance or similar feature) that has a minimum depth of 4 feet;
 - b. Extension (e.g., floor area, deck, patio, entrance or similar feature) that projects a minimum of 2 feet and runs horizontally for a minimum length of 4 feet; and/or
 - c. Offsets or breaks in roof elevation of 2 feet or greater in height.
 - d. All building elevations visible from a public street right-of-way shall provide doors, porches, balconies, and/or windows. The standard applies to each full and partial building story.

5. **Detailed Architectural Features.** All buildings shall provide detailed design along all elevations (e.g., front, rear and sides). Detailed design requires use of at least five of the following architectural features on all front and exterior side (corner lot) elevations and at least three of the following architectural features on all interior and rear yard elevations, at a minimum of every 30 lineal feet of horizontal wall or portion thereof. Architectural features shall be varied on the different building elevations. The standard applies to each full and partial building story.
 - a. Dormers
 - b. Gables
 - c. Recessed entries
 - d. Covered porch entries
 - e. Cupolas or towers
 - f. Pillars or posts
 - g. Eaves (minimum 6-inch projection)
 - h. Off-sets in building face or roof (minimum 16 inches)
 - i. Window trim on all windows on the facade
 - j. Bay or oriel windows
 - k. Balconies
 - l. Decorative patterns on exterior finishes (e.g., scales/shingles, wainscoting, ornamentation, and similar features)

- m. Decorative cornices and roof lines (e.g., for flat roofs)
 - n. An alternative feature providing visual relief and detail, similar to options a-m above, may be approved through the development review process.
6. Exterior Finish. The exterior finish on all vertical surfaces shall be comprised primarily of materials such as masonry/wood lap siding, shingles, brick or stucco. The use of sheet metal, plywood, T1-11 siding, smooth face cinder block and other similar materials is not permitted. Textured cinder blocks may be permitted on side and rear facades, but shall not exceed 40% of the total exterior wall area of the ground/bottom floor.
7. Building Mass and Scale. Third and fourth stories of multifamily dwellings and complexes, and/or all portions of the structure above 20 feet in height, in residential zones shall occupy no more than 80% of the building footprint area (ground floor), and shall have walls set back no less than 4 feet from the continuous vertical plane created by the walls of the first floor, excluding design and architectural features such as recessions, extensions (i.e. decks, covered entries, windows, doors).
8. Building Alignment. There shall be no window to adjoining window alignment when adjacent buildings are less than 30 feet apart.
9. Trash Receptacles. A common trash enclosure shall be required and is subject to the following standards.
- a. Trash enclosures shall be oriented away from adjacent residences and shall be screened.
 - b. Trash enclosures shall be accessible to trash pick-up vehicles.
 - c. Trash enclosures, a minimum of six-feet in height, shall be constructed of solid, durable and attractive walls, with solid screen doors and shall be visually consistent with project architecture.
 - d. A minimum two (2) foot irrigated and landscaped perimeter shall be provided around the enclosure (excepting door entries).
 - e. Enclosure areas shall contain sufficient space to accommodate both waste disposal and recycling containers adequate to accommodate the degree of development. Documentation from the applicable trash collection company shall indicate that the area and type of container(s) will be adequate to accommodate the amount of refuse that is anticipated to be generated on a ordinary basis.
10. Mechanical Equipment. External mechanical equipment, such as heating or cooling equipment, pumps or generators, that is located on the ground or on the roof of buildings, must be entirely screened from view by sight obscuring walls, fences, parapets or other similar means consistent with the overall architecture of the development. Landscaping is not an acceptable alternative for such screening as specified herein. Screening shall be compliant with all applicable fire codes.

11. Common Open Space. A minimum of 15 percent of site area (inclusive of required setbacks but exclusive of dedicated street rights-of-way and land dedicated to other public uses like parks and schools), shall be provided as common open space and be suitable for a recreational play area, or group or community activities. However, in no case shall less than 3,000 square feet of common open space be provided. Such area shall be improved with grass, plantings, surfacing, equipment or buildings suitable for recreational use. The Hearings Body may require this area to be protected from streets, parking areas, or the like, by a fence or the equivalent. Sensitive lands and historic buildings or landmarks open to the public and designated by the Comprehensive Plan may be counted toward meeting the common open space requirements.
12. Private Open Space. Private open space shall be required for all multi-family units based on the following standards:
 - a. Ground/bottom floor housing units shall have front or rear patios or decks at least 4 feet deep and measuring at least 48 square feet in area.
 - b. A minimum of 50% of all upper floor (second floor and above) housing units shall have balconies or porches at least 4 feet deep and measuring at least 48 square feet in area.
 - c. To the maximum extent possible, private open space areas shall be oriented toward common open space areas and away from adjacent single family residences, parking areas and driveways and trash enclosures.
13. Special Yards. In order to allow air circulation and light, the distance between buildings on the same lot shall be as follows:
 - a. An inner court providing access to double-row dwelling groups shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width.
 - b. The distance between principal buildings on the same lot shall be no less than 12 feet.
14. Special Fencing/Landscaping. A sight obscuring fence or evergreen hedge may be required by the Hearings Body when, in its judgment, such screening is necessary to preserve the values of nearby properties, protect the aesthetic character of the neighborhood or vicinity, and to provide security for occupants of the subject complex.
15. Storage. There shall be no outdoor storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the complex. All multifamily dwellings and complexes shall provide for storage of furniture, tools, equipment, building materials or supplies belonging to the occupants or management of the complex. Each dwelling unit shall have its one assigned storage area, which is a minimum 18 square feet, and shall be securable. Storage areas may be indoor, such as attached or detached garages, or within specific areas that are internal to each dwelling unit. Storage areas may also be within outdoor structures such as within a separate storage

building on premises. The City may exempt or reduce the storage space requirement for “specialty housing” such as housing for the elderly or for housing for long-term infirm care.

16. Off-Street Parking. The number of off street parking spaces shall be provided in conformance with Section 8.0500 through 8.0515 of the City of Redmond Code. Multi-family dwellings and complexes shall comply with the City’s access policies regarding vehicle access and provide adequate pedestrian ways to safely navigate the parking areas and to connect to the public sidewalks. Adequate internal vehicle access shall be designed to minimize or eliminate vehicle/vehicle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. Off-street parking areas shall not be placed between the primary building elevations and public streets. Parallel parking shall not be permitted on any common or shared driveways or private drives less than 28’ in width.
17. Bicycle Parking. One (1) covered bicycle parking space shall be provided for every two (2) dwelling units. Covered bicycle parking spaces may be located within a garage, storage shed, basement or similar area, provided the area is not otherwise obstructed with mechanical equipment. In those instances where there is no garage or other easily accessible storage area, the bicycles shall be sheltered from sun precipitation by an independent structure specifically designed for such. Covered bicycle parking areas shall be evenly distributed throughout the development. The City may exempt or reduce the covered bicycle parking space requirement for “specialty housing” such as housing for the elderly or for housing for long-term infirm care.



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756
(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

Exhibit 2

DATE: January 17, 2012
TO: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission Members
FROM: Heather Richards, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Discussion – 2012/13 Workplan

Report in Brief:

Background:

At the beginning of each calendar year, staff works with the Planning Commission to draft a work plan for that calendar year and the 2012/13 fiscal year. This helps to inform staffing and budget needs for the work plan. With the slowdown in the economy, this is especially helpful, since most of the work of the Planning Commission is focused on long-range planning projects.

Discussion

Attached are two documents. Attachment A is a list of recommended projects to consider based on previous commission work plans and staff recommendations. Attachment B is a proposed process and timeframe for amending the Sign Code which has been discussed as a early 2012 project for the Planning Commission.

Please consider the attached list and prioritize those projects which you would like to see move forward in 2012, as well as any additional projects that you would like the Planning Commission to consider.

Heather Richards,
Community Development Director



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756
(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

ATTACHMENT A

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2012
TO: REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS
FROM: HEATHER RICHARDS, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED PROJECTS FOR WORK PLAN DISCUSSION

Development Code Amendments *(carried forward from previous PC work plans):*

- Multi-Family Housing and Complex Design Standards
- Sign Code
- Subdivision Code – Connectivity, neighborhood transition, housing design standards
- Codification of Sustainability – Storm Drainage, Screening wind turbines v. solar panels, promoting a “Green” agenda.
- Public Health – 20 minute neighborhoods, walkability, access to recreation, healthy foods, etc.

Area Plan Initiatives: CDD has a goal of developing one Area Plan a year for the UH 10 Zone to prepare for future development and master planning requests. There are two area plans that exist for the Northwest Area Plan and the Highway Area Plan. In the past couple of years there has been pressure in the southwestern UH10 for an area plan due to the construction of the new Ridgeview High School. Staff applied for a DLCD grant to hire a consultant to develop that area plan but was unsuccessful. Staff believes that working with the Planning Commission we can internally develop an area plan for the Southwestern area.

Comprehensive Plan Acknowledge Amendments Clean-Up:

- Develop flow chart of adopted plans
- Research how plans were adopted and acknowledged as comp plan amendments.
- Follow appropriate process to ensure that those plans which should be officially acknowledged as comp plan amendments are accurate.

Review and recommendation of current planning efforts:

- Bicycle Refinement Plan – TSP Amendment
- Professional Business and Medical District Master Plan
- South US 97 Highway Corridor Plan
- City Center Housing Density Study
- City Center Circulation Study
- Redmond Development Commission Strategic Plan – Comp Plan Evaluation

ATTACHMENT B:

City of Redmond Sign Code Update Process and Timeline (Calendar 2012)

- I. Review existing code and identify specific portions to be revised (January, 2012)
 - Staff to identify portions of the existing code that are out of date; do not meet existing city policies; are difficult to enforce; etc.
- II. Research alternative sign codes from other jurisdictions (January – February, 2012)
 - Review local, national and standardized sign codes
 - Identify communities that have faced similar issues – develop a list and means of resolving specific issues
 - Identify a code format that is preferable
 - Develop a “stand alone” code section
- III. Public involvement process (March – August, 2012)
 - Create and convene stakeholder committee
 - Committee comprised of: business owners, sign company representatives, business organization representatives (i.e. chamber of commerce); citizens at large; public agency representatives (i.e. ODOT – signs along highway)
 - Regularly meet with stakeholder committee for:
 - Initial review of existing sign code (based on staff analysis of existing difficulties in administering code)
 - Review existing signs in community; potential violations; good/bad
 - Specify problem areas within the existing code
 - Section by section review of draft code
 - Seek approval of stakeholder committee on public review draft
- IV. Planning Commission review process (March – October, 2012)
 - Initial discussion with Planning Commission to discuss the need for the code update, to outline the update process, to discuss issues to be addressed during the update, timeline, etc.
 - Work sessions with the Planning Commission on specific issues/sections of the Code (i.e. sign types; signs as identification versus advertisement; enforcement;)
 - Review according to same schedule of issues as with the stakeholder committee (section by section review)
 - Ensure stakeholder committee attendance at Planning Commission work session – with possible Planning Commission liaison to the stakeholder committee
 - Updates to City Council (1 or 2 during the process)
 - Public hearing and recommendation
- V. City Council adoption process (October – December, 2012)
 - Work session(s) with City Council to describe process and primary changes to the code – with rationale and description of the public process
 - Public hearings – desire is that the public involvement process (with stakeholder committee and Planning Commission) will result in support for the new code during the City Council review
 - Adoption

* The public involvement process may be expedited depending upon meeting schedule.

**DRAFT**

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

Tuesday, October 4, 2011

City Hall Conference Room A, 716 SW Evergreen Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair Eric Porter, Vice Chair Will Van Vactor, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, Stan Clark, Katie McDonald (1 position vacant)

City Staff: Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; James Lewis, *Long-Range Planner*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: None

(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 p.m. with a quorum present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

III. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION

A. Wireless and Broadcast Communication Facilities (TA 11-06)

Mr. Lewis presented a report (October 4, 2011, memo; PowerPoint) on the results of staff and legal counsel research and explained the rationale behind staff changes to the draft code.

Following extensive discussion, Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to the following changes:

- * 8.0410: “**Enclosure** means an area, fenced or otherwise, around the perimeter on which the equipment building, shelter, cabinet, or other ancillary facilities are located.” “**Facility** means the conglomeration of all the elements that comprise a cell tower unit.” Replace the word “facility” with “element” when the text is about part of the total facility. Verify that the definition of “**screened**” is consistent with the design criteria.
- * 8.0415(2): Remove.
- * 8.0420(8)(H) to read: “Parking. Provide a site plan showing the vehicular driveway and circulation pattern adequate for the number of maintenance vehicles and equipment.”
- * 8.0425(2), Sentence 1: Reword to make references to the height of a tower consistent.
- * 8.0430(7): Change the word “regime” to “regimen” in Sentence 2.
- * 8.0430(9) to read: “A paved access driveway a minimum of 10 feet wide and a paved vehicular parking area suitable to accommodate anticipated service vehicles and turnaround shall be provided between public rights-of-way and the site in residential zones. Access driveways and turnarounds can be unpaved in industrial zones.”
- * 8.0430(13)(E): Retain with red-underlined text.

Commissioners also agreed to continue their deliberations on October 18, 2011. Topics to address at the next meeting included communication facilities in the UH-10 zone and capitalization consistency throughout the draft.

IV. WORK SESSION

A. Redmond Development Commission – Strategic Plan Comments

Mr. Lewis presented his staff report (October 4, 2011, memo) plus a new draft which included PC comments from the last meeting. The Strategic Planning review and development process will continue for the next few months through City Council review and adoption.

Chair Porter said that PC comments to the draft should represent a consensus of Commissioner opinions about things within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction. Individual Commissioner opinions should be provided directly to staff.

Individual Commissioner concerns included Business Strategy 4 – Action Plan A: Add “Housing Works” and “Neighbor Impact” nonprofit agencies to those already listed. Update Redmond Comprehensive Plan Chapter 10 (Housing).

Following discussion, Commissioners agreed **by consensus** that staff make the following changes in the draft:

- * **Business Development:** Strategy 2, Action A: Staff and Planning Commission to evaluate mixed-use zones for adequacy. Action B: Low land costs contradict the concept of enhanced-value neighborhoods. Action C: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Strategy 4, Action D: Reword to read – “Promote Redmond through displaying marketing collateral at destination resorts, the Airport, and other venues within the tourism industry.” Strategy 5, Action B: Add updating the Buildable Lands Inventory to determine the rate of expansion for C-3 properties.
- * **Airport:** Goal – Delete red PC text. Strategy 1 – Delete red PC text. Action B: Delete red PC text. Action E: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Strategy 2, Action A, and Strategy 3, Action B: Delete red PC text.
- * **Infrastructure:** Strategy 1 – Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Action A: Continually update Buildable Lands Inventory. Action C: Replace “quarterly” with “regularly.” Strategy 3, Action A: Establish good relationship with Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council. Action B: Revise to read – “Connect the planned overpass at O’Neil Junction with Highway 97.” Action D: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Strategy 4 – Action Plans B and C: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment.
- * **Livability-Housing:** Strategy 1, Action B: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Action C: Retain red PC text as “Planning Commission” comment. Strategy 2 – Action D: Review housing data for validity. Update Buildable Lands Inventory. Action E: How can this be managed when the city boundary is ever-changing? Encourage higher-density development in the urban core.
- * **Livability-Attractiveness:** Strategy 1, Action B: Implement and enforce weed abatement procedures along 19th Street corridor. Implement Highway 97 reroute beautification plan.

Chair Porter postponed further discussion to the next Planning Commission meeting.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion 3 (4/0/2): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the August 16, 2011, minutes as written. Commissioner Bleile seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman, Bleile, Porter, and Van Vactor voting in favor and Commissioners Clark and McDonald abstaining.

Motion 4 (4/0/2): Commissioner McDonald moved to approve the September 6, 2011, minutes as written. Commissioner Allman seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman, McDonald, Porter, and Van Vactor voting in favor and Commissioners Bleile and Clark abstaining.

Motion 5 (3/0/3): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the September 20, 2011, minutes as written. Commissioner Bleile seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman, Bleile, and Van Vactor voting in favor and Commissioners Clark, McDonald, and Porter abstaining.

VI. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)**VII. STAFF COMMENTS**

Mr. Lewis reminded Commissioners that October 18 agenda topics included deliberation on Wireless and Broadcast Communication Facilities and a work session on the draft Strategic Plan.

Ms. Richards reported receiving two applications for the vacant Commissioner position and asked Commissioners to help recruit. The Regional Economic Opportunity Analysis (REOA) committee recommended six large-lot industrial sites in three counties. Two of these sites are in Redmond: 465 acres on the east side owned by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and 900 acres on the south side owned by the Oregon Division of State Lands. 1000 Friends of Oregon testified against the county's proposed comprehensive plan amendment. The Board of County Commissioners requested that REOA collaborate with 1000 Friends to develop a proposal that will work for everyone.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chair Porter asked about changing the starting time for meetings. Following discussion, Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to meet at 6:30 p.m. from October 18, 2011, forward.

Commissioner Clark requested an update on the Mixed Use Live/Work Zone. Mr. Lewis said that the City Council public hearing has been continued to November 8, 2011. Councilors are split on whether to include offices. They also want to consider adding back the R-4 area that Planning Commission recommended excluding.

IX. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2011.

ATTEST:

Eric Porter, Chair

**DRAFT**

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

Tuesday, October 18, 2011

City Hall Conference Room A, 716 SW Evergreen Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Vice Chair Will Van Vactor, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, Stan Clark, Katie McDonald (*absent:* Eric Porter; 1 position vacant)

City Staff: Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; James Lewis, *Long-Range Planner*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Libbi and Robert Albright, Camille McClafin

(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

Vice Chair Van Vactor opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. with a quorum present. Commissioner McDonald arrived at 7:05 p.m.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

III. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION

A. Wireless and Broadcast Communication Facilities (TA 11-06)

Mr. Lewis presented the staff report (October 18, 2011, memo) and reviewed Planning Commission-directed changes from the last meeting that were based on citizen, legal counsel, and staff comments.

Following discussion, Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to support compliance with the federal Telecommunications Act and avoid legal challenges for the City by not adding Bruce White's suggested language about siting these facilities within specific areas of residential zones.

Motion 1 (5/0/0): Commissioner Clark moved that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council the adoption of TA 11-06, Redmond Development Code Amendments, to repeal in their entirety Sections 8.0400 through 8.0490, Tower and Antenna Standards, and add Sections 8.0400 through 8.0450, Wireless and Broadcast Communication Facilities, subject to modification of the following sections: 8.0410 (Definitions): "**Enclosure** means an area, fenced or otherwise delineated, around the perimeter on which the equipment building, shelter, cabinet, or other ancillary facilities are located." "**Facility**, as used in this Chapter, is inclusive of all the elements of wireless or broadcast communication facilities, as they may be more specifically defined herein." 8.0430(1)(B) (General Development Standards, Visual Impact), Sentence 4 to read: "Towers clustered on the same site shall be of similar height and design unless the existing tower does not comply with the standards herein, in which case the new facility must comply with

the standards prescribed herein.” Commissioner Allman seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Allman left at 7:30 p.m.

IV. WORK SESSION

A. Redmond Development Commission – Strategic Plan Comments

Mr. Lewis presented his staff report (October 18, 2011, memo) plus a new draft which included Planning Commission comments from the last meeting.

Motion 2 (4/0/0): Commissioner Clark moved that the Planning Commission recommend sending its official comments to the Redmond Development Commission including the following changes from tonight’s discussion: **Livability-Attractiveness:** Strategy 1, Action A: Add a task to “implement the Highway 97 Beautification Plan” (move from current location under Strategy 3, Action B). Strategy 3, Action B: Add a task to identify significant viewsheds for preservation. **Livability-Downtown:** Strategy 1, Action B: Add tasks to “provide signage and areas for oversized-vehicle parking.” Strategies 1 and 2: Add a task to “adopt and implement the Redmond Bicycle Refinement Plan.” Strategy 2, Action C: Add tasks to “provide adequate pedestrian access between commercial uses and other zones” and “provide adequate bicycle transportation between commercial uses and other zones.” For safety, pedestrian and bicycle transportation systems should be separated. Commissioner McDonald seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Richards said that staff will review all comments and suggestions made by the Planning Commission and site them in appropriate places within the draft Strategic Plan.

V. 2012 WORK PLAN

Discussion postponed to the next meeting.

VI. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Lewis said that City Council will hold a work session on the Wireless and Broadcast Communication Facility amendments at its October 19 meeting. City Council will probably schedule a public hearing on this issue for November 8, 2011. Also on the November 8 agenda will be the continued public hearing on the Mixed Use Live/Work Zone.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Vice Chair Van Vactor reported that Chair Porter was concerned about the City’s allowing a reduction in parking for a multi-family complex in a recent land use decision (SP 11-04). If not yet resolved, Chair Porter wants the Planning Commission to review it. Mr. Bleile said that he agreed with Chair Porter that this issue deserved further study. Mr. Clark reported receiving a letter today from Mr. Cook that the decision had been withdrawn.

Ms. Richards said that she will e-mail the results of her investigation into this issue to Commissioners on October 19, 2011. She will also confirm that the Planning Commission will be able to make a legal decision on this issue via e-mail.

IX. ADJOURN

With no further business, Vice Chair Van Vactor adjourned the meeting at 8 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day
of _____, 2011.

ATTEST:

Will Van Vactor, Vice Chair

**DRAFT**

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

Tuesday, December 20, 2011

City Hall Conference Room A, 716 SW Evergreen Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair Eric Porter, Vice Chair Will Van Vactor, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, Stan Clark, Katie McDonald (1 position vacant)

City Staff: Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; James Lewis, *Long-Range Planner*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Margie Dawson, *City Councilor*

(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 6:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

III. WORK SESSION

A. Redmond Development Code – Site & Design Review Standards for Multi-Family Dwellings and Complexes – Amendments

Mr. Lewis presented the staff report (December 20, 2011, memo). The current setback standards for multi-family housing are too prescriptive. Current multi-family setback standards were developed to prevent the worst-case scenario, but don't achieve the best design and are making it hard to meet density requirements. Though the variance process has been utilized successfully to create more beneficial development for both the City and developers, the process is cumbersome, lengthy, and responsive rather than affirmative. Staff would like to remove current barriers to development and provide positive direction about the type of development desired.

Commissioner discussion covered *enforcement of homeowner association standards and CC&Rs, impact of requiring individual water meters for apartment units, preventing multi-family neighborhoods in the R-4 zone, meeting comprehensive plan densities, protecting open space in multi-family developments, and avoiding blight-causing policies.*

Ms. Richards said that the City is researching legal measures to enforce CC&Rs and how other communities deal with maintenance issues. She will update the Commission at a later date.

By consensus, Commissioners asked staff to draft new code for multi-family developments based on concerns raised tonight, provide comparisons between existing and proposed code standards, present photos of existing undesirable multi-family housing, and provide visual

examples of desirable developments. Vice Chair Van Vactor requested links to sample codes from other jurisdictions.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS

Councilor Dawson reported that Council adopted the Mixed Use Live/Work Zone as recommended by Planning Commission.

V. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Lewis said that City Council will be filling the vacant Commissioner position in January 2012.

Ms. Richards said that the City will be amending the Sign Code. The City's new airport manager (Kim Dickie) will start in mid-January 2012 and the current manager (Carrie Novick) will stay through the end of January 2012. Public Works Director Chris Doty has resigned in order to manage the Deschutes County Road Department.

VI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chair Porter recommended seeking feedback from store owners during the Sign Code update process and electing a Chair and Vice Chair at the January 2012 meeting. Sisters is collaborating with Redmond and Deschutes County to expand the Greater Redmond Enterprise Zone to include the Sisters Airport.

VII. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Porter/Vice Chair Van Vactor adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2012.

ATTEST:

Eric Porter, Chair