



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

**REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

**City Hall – Conference Room A**  
**716 SW Evergreen Avenue**

**Tuesday, February 21, 2012,**  
**6:30 PM**

**Agenda**

<b>UAPC Members</b>	
Eric Porter, Chair	<b>I. CALL TO ORDER</b>
Will Van Vactor, Vice Chair	<b>II. CITIZEN COMMENTS</b>
Tory Allman	<b>III. WORK SESSION –</b>  <b>a. Proposed Development Code Amendments, Section 8.3035(4)(E) – Site and Design Review Standards for Multi-family Dwellings, Complexes-Amendments (Exhibit 1)</b>
Bob Bleile	<b>IV. COUNCIL LIASON COMMENTS (if present)</b>
Stan Clark	<b>V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</b> <b>a. January 17, 2012 (Exhibit 2)</b>
Anne Graham	<b>VI. STAFF COMMENTS</b>
Katie McDonald	<b>VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS</b>
	<b>VIII. ADJOURN</b>

\*Please note that these documents are also available on the City's website [www.ci.redmond.or.us](http://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](mailto: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](http://www.ci.redmond.or.us)

## EXHIBIT 1

**DATE:** February 21, 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 fourth 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.

One attachment has been provided as a reference:

Attachment A shows proposed changes and additions to the existing code (shown in ~~striketrough~~ and red (new) text) – Planning Commission and Staff suggested changes to the text presented at the previous Planning Commission work session are highlighted in yellow.

### 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:

- 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);

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

- 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 the City, the residents and the property owners.

At the Planning Commission meeting on December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011, the specific issues listed above were discussed. At the meeting on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012, the Commission discussed specific issues related to: water and service requirements; City participation in administering covenants conditions and restrictions through homeowners associations; the viability of various multi-family development types; and, density issues. The Planning Commission explained that they understand the intent of the existing Development Code provisions, but also realize 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. At the February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2012 meeting, the Planning Commission began examining the proposed amendments as suggested by staff, with further suggested amendments which are reflected in Attachment A.

### **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 proposed 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.

Changes to Table A – At the last work session there was discussion about the minimum lot size requirements in Table A, the additional square footage required for each additional bedroom per unit for multi-family complexes, and the effectiveness of that method of calculating necessary lot area. The rationale for the additional square footage for each additional bedroom is based upon premise that more bedrooms mean more people living in the unit (or overall on site) – especially so when the development is a multi-family *complex* which contemplates 5 or more units on one site. Thus, the conclusion is drawn that more people living in the multi-family development mean that more land area is necessary for on-site amenities such as parking, open space, recreational amenities, etc. Although this rationale seems logical, it is difficult to administer and does not guarantee that the additional space will be used for any practical purpose other than additional open space. Staff’s suggested amendments are an attempt to simplify the table calculations and are based on each unit having an average of 2 bedrooms. From staff’s experience, most medium to large sized multi-family developments have a variety of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. However, the number of 1 bedroom units is minimal, 3 bedroom units are the next highest amount, and 2 bedroom units are the most predominant. The overall *average* is typically between 2 and 2.5 bedrooms per unit (but varies depending on the specific market). This is based on national development trends, and is typical of what the market demands from multi-family housing locally as well. Staff believes that by using the lot area necessary for 2 bedroom units (under the existing code) as the overall average for multi-family complexes, combined with the reduction in building separation and reduced setbacks, the overall lot area available for multi-family complexes will be similar to that which is necessary under the existing code, but will be easier to understand and administer, and will allow more efficient use of land.

In addition to the integral changes to Table A regarding lot area calculations, Staff is recommending a change to title for the “Minimum Lot Size” section to now be called “Minimum Lot Area per Unit.” The reason for this is that the standards in the table are not necessarily applied during the lot creation (subdivision) process. Rather, the minimum lot areas are applied at the time the multi-family development is proposed (during the site and design review process). The Lot Areas apply and are calculated proportionately to the number of units created. However, if a developer is subdividing

property with the ultimate intent being a multi-family development, the lot area requirements listed in Table A will need to be part of the forethought during the subdivision phase (lots will need to be created to meet the lot area per unit requirements for the type of multi-family development that is to be constructed in the future). Nonetheless, the lot area requirements per unit are not in and of themselves requirements for the subdivision and are not directly applicable during the subdivision process. Rather, the minimum lot sizes and maximum densities of the zone are applicable, with the resulting lot sizes that are created being the controlling factor on any permissible use that is allowed in that zone.

The parking requirements of Table A necessitate 2 spaces per dwelling unit (regardless of the size of the unit). This is the same requirements as for a single family dwelling (again, regardless of the size of the dwelling/unit). This requirement seems equitable and appropriate. However, unlike single family dwellings, which typically have a two car garage and some on-street parking, multi-family developments do not. For that reason, the multi-family development parking requirements also necessitate an additional space for a manager of the unit (assuming that manager will regularly visit if not live on-site), and an additional space for every 5 dwelling units (assuming that guests of residents will visit and park on-site). Staff did not propose any changes to this standard from the existing code. Also, it is ultimately the developer's obligation to balance the overall number of units with the ability to provide the required number of on-site parking spaces (as well as other required on-site amenities such as landscape area). Thus, Staff believes the primary issues is whether or not the number of spaces required for guests is adequate to meet the need. Planning Commissioners have noted that in some instances multi-family developments do not have enough parking for residents and guests. If the number of guest required parking is increased, this must be balanced against the land area required to provide the parking and whether or not that reduces the overall number of units that can be constructed on-site.

Staff Examples – Staff will provide visual examples of a variety of multi-family housing types for review and comparison at the work session as the standards are further discussed.

Planning Commission Direction – Staff is seeking further direction from the Planning Commission regarding the proposed draft amendments, as compared to the existing Development Code standards. Through direct discussion of the proposed amendments at the work sessions, 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. Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for a “public hearing draft” that can be the subject of further public review and comment. Although

Next Discussion – The Planning Commission discussion on the proposed Code amendments concluded before section 5 (on page 5 of Attachment A). Therefore, Attachment A only includes changes up to and including Section 4 of the code, as described above.

Public Hearing – A public hearing is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2012.

### **Alternative Courses of Action:**

Continue to work with Staff to revise the draft text through subsequent work sessions while also beginning the public involvement process (establishing a public review timeline, public and agency notice). A public hearing has been tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2012 for this proposal, and public notice will be printed in the Redmond Spokesman on February 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

### **Recommendation/Suggested Motion:**

Not applicable.

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

## Attachment A:

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

### Article I, Zoning Standards: Residential Zone (Section 8.0140, Table B, Minimum Standards)

**8.0140 Table B, Minimum Standards.** The following minimum standards apply in each of the Residential zones as follows:

Standard:	Zone:				
	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5
<b>Minimum Lot size - Square Feet</b>					
Single Family	9,000	9,000	7,500	6,000	6,000
Duplex	NA	<sup>D</sup> 10,000	<sup>A</sup> 10,000	7,500	7,500
Duplex Lot			4,250	3,750	3,750
Townhouse				E	E
Multi-family Dwelling	NA	NA	NA	7,500/2 units	7,500/2 units
add per unit				<b>F</b> 1,250	<b>F</b> 1,250
Multi-family Complex	NA	NA	NA	7,500+	7,500+
Studio add per additional unit				<b>F</b> 750	<b>F</b> 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
<b>Maximum Density (1 unit per # s.f.)</b> <b>F</b>				3,000	2,500
<b>Minimum Setback Distance</b> <sup>C</sup> <b>F</b>					
Front	15	15	15	15	15
Interior Side	<sup>B</sup> 5/10	<sup>B</sup> 5/10	<sup>B</sup> 5/10	<sup>B</sup> 5/10	5
Street Side	15	15	15	15	15
Rear	20	20	20	20	5
Garage	20	20	20	20	20
<b>Maximum Building Height</b> <b>F</b>	30	30	30	40,E	40,E
<b>Minimum Street Frontage</b>					
Standard Street	50	50	50	50	50
Cul-de-sac	30	30	30	30	30
Flag Lot	20	20	20	20	20
Duplex lot (non flag or cul de sac)	N/A	N/A	25	25	25
Townhouse				E	E

A Duplexes permitted only on corner lots

B Interior side yards must provide a minimum of 5 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other side for single family and duplex residences. Where alley access is provided, both interior side yards may be reduced to 5'. Exceptions to this 10' setback are allowed (1) when the lot was created prior to the

adoption of this standard (November 9, 2006); or (2) on cul de sac lots; or (3) on flag lots, or (4) parcels created by partition.
C Does not include solar setbacks, which are calculated separately
D Duplexes only allowed on legally created lots of adequate size / created prior to November 9, 2006, otherwise prohibited.
E Pursuant to the Townhouse Development Standards in Chapter 8, Article IV Site and Design Review Standards, Section 8.3035.4.f.2, Table A.
F Does not apply to development standards for Multi-family Dwellings and Multi-family Complexes. Development standards for Multi-family Dwellings and Multi-family Complexes are located in Chapter 8, Article IV, Site and Design Review Standards, Section 8.3035.4.E.2., Table A.
N/A = "not allowed"
All distances shown are measured in feet.

**Article IV, Site and Design Review Standards:  
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.

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. **This section establishes a process for the review of multi-family dwelling and multi-family complex development proposals in order to promote functional, safe, innovative and attractive development that is compatible with the natural and man-made environment. The intent is: to promote compatible development; to promote stability of property values; to foster the attractiveness and functional utility of multi-family development; to protect public and private investments in the area; and, to raise the level of community expectations for the quality of its environment.**
  - ~~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.

<b>Standard:</b>	<b>R-4</b>	<b>R-5</b>
<b>Minimum Lot size Area Per Unit - Square Feet</b>		
Multi-family Dwelling	7,500/2 units	7,500/2 units
add per unit	1,500	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
	<b>15,000</b>	<b>12,500</b>
<b>Maximum Density (1 unit per # s.f.)</b>	3,000	2,500
<b>Minimum Setback Distance <sup>(A)</sup></b>		
Front	15	15
Side	15	15
Rear	20	15
Garage	20	20
<b>Maximum Building Height</b>	40	40
<b>Off Street Parking</b>		
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. 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 functional primary entrance oriented to each the public street frontage. 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 streets 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. In order to preclude large expanses of uninterrupted building surfaces, each floor of the building shall include at least two of the following features within every 30 lineal feet or portion thereof along all elevations of the structure:
- 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. **Offset or breaks in building facade elevations of 2 feet or greater in relief.**

Notwithstanding the above standards, all building elevations visible from a public street right-of way shall provide doors, porches, balconies, and/or windows **within every 30 lineal feet or portion thereof along all elevations of the structure.** 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 a 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:
- 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. ~~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:
  - 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.*(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))*

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

## REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

### Minutes

Tuesday, January 17, 2012

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, Anne Graham (*absent:* Katie McDonald)

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

**Visitors:** Margie Dawson, *City Councilor*; Frank Graham; Trish Pinkerton, *Redmond Spokesman*; Jody Porter

*(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 6:33 p.m. with a quorum present.

#### II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)

#### III. FIRST MEETING OF THE YEAR BUSINESS

##### A. Introduction/Swearing In of New Commissioners

Councilor Dawson administered the oath of office to new Commissioner Graham.

##### B. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2012

**Motion 1** (9/0/0): Mr. Bleile moved to nominate Mr. Porter to serve as Chair for 2012. Mr. Porter agreed to serve. Mr. Clark seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

**Motion 2** (9/0/0): Mr. Bleile moved to nominate Mr. Van Vactor to serve as Vice Chair for 2012. Mr. Van Vactor agreed to serve. Mr. Clark seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

#### V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS

Councilor Dawson reported that Chris Doty has left; City Engineer Mike Caccavano is serving as interim Public Works Director. New Airport Manager Kim Dickey started today and former Airport Manager Carrie Novick will be working another week or two to facilitate the transition.

#### IV. WORK SESSION

##### A. Proposed Development Code Amendments, Section 8.3035(4)(E) – Site and Design Review Standards for Multi-Family Dwellings, Complexes

Mr. Lewis presented the staff report (January 17, 2012, memo) and draft code language based on Commissioner feedback at their last meeting. Staff research indicated that the City can be a

party to homeowner CC&Rs but that enforcing development code standards would be a sounder policy. Staff recommended retaining a variety of housing types and tightening standards.

Discussion covered *site use efficiency, second-floor setbacks, building separation, effective open space, long-term maintenance, effect of code changes on master-planned developments, why private streets are allowed within city limits, re-evaluating density citywide, and interim solutions.*

Ms. Graham promised to forward wordsmithing changes on draft code amendments for multi-family developments to staff.

Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to continue discussion at their next meeting. Commissioners asked staff to research private road standards, the effect of all roads inside city limits being built to public standards, and how the City can assure homeowner associations are set up properly.

#### B. Discussion of 2012 Work Plan

Mr. Lewis presented the staff report (January 17, 2012, memo). Many of the projects listed for consideration have been carried forward from previous PC work plans. These included development code amendments (multi-family housing/complex design standards, sign code, subdivision code, sustainability codification, public health), area plan initiatives, comprehensive plan clean-up, and review/recommendations on current planning efforts.

Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to continue their discussion at the next meeting. Prior to the next meeting, Commissioner Bleile will meet with staff, Chair Porter, and Vice Chair Van Vactor to see if his issues (private streets, effectiveness of homeowner associations, R-4 densities, and water meters) can be accommodated in the 2012 work plan.

Mr. Lewis said that he will be scheduling this issue for a public hearing on March 6, 2012, to comply with the 35-day legal notice requirement of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.

## VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

**Motion 4** (2/0/4): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the October 18, 2011, minutes as written. Commissioner Van Vactor seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman and Van Vactor voting in favor and Commissioners Bleile, Clark, Graham, and Porter abstaining.

**Motion 5** (4/0/2): Commissioner Allman moved to approve the December 20, 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 Graham abstaining.

## VII. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Richards said that Senate Bill 186 proposes designating a 456-acre, OSPR-zoned parcel as a site of statewide economic development significance, thus exempting it from the statewide Transportation Planning Rule. A hearing will be held on January 18, 2012, before the Oregon Senate Transportation, Business, and Economic Development Committee. 1000 Friends of Oregon has filed an appeal before the Land Use Board of Appeals on an REOA (Redmond Economic Opportunities Analysis) parcel south of the fairgrounds. 1000 Friends met with

Deschutes County Commissioners last week to explore the possibility of an out-of-court settlement. Staff changes: Kim Dickey, the new airport manager, started today. Current Airport Manager Carrie Novick will work through the end of January 2012 to facilitate the transition. The City has hired Heather Cassaro, formerly with the Redmond Chamber of Commerce, to handle communications and marketing. City Engineer Mike Caccavano has been appointed as the interim Public Works Director and applications are being accepted.

**VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Graham said that she was happy to be here and able to contribute.

Chair Porter welcomed Ms. Graham.

Commissioners asked staff to e-mail the “all-comments” and “final” drafts of Redmond Development Commission’s strategic plan.

**IX. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

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

ATTEST:

---

Eric Porter, Chair