



**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**

**Conference Room A**

**716 SW Evergreen Avenue**

**Tuesday, December 4, 2012**

**6:30 PM**

**Agenda**

<b>UAPC Members</b>	
Eric Porter, Chair	<b>I. CALL TO ORDER</b>
Anne Graham, Vice-Chair	<b>II. CITIZEN COMMENTS</b>
Bob Bleile	<b>III. WORKSESSION</b> <b>1. Residential Design Standards - Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Residences and Duplexes (Exhibit 1) - continued discussion from 11-6-2012 meeting</b> <b>2. Fence Standards (Exhibit 2)</b> <b>3. Sign Standards - Flags (Exhibit 3-Power Point)</b>
Bea Leach	<b>IV. COUNCIL LIASON COMMENTS (if present)</b>
Katie McDonald	<b>V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Exhibit 4)</b> <b>a. November 6, 2012</b>
Vacant Position	<b>VI. STAFF COMMENTS</b>
Vacant Position	<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:** December 4, 2012  
**TO:** Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission  
**FROM:** James J. Lewis, Senior Planner, Long Range/Economic Planning  
**SUBJECT:** Residential Design Standards – Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes – Work Session

---

### Report in Brief:

This is a third work session to discuss draft text amendments for the regulation of residential design elements for new single family dwellings and duplexes. The residential design elements were first discussed with the Planning Commission during the review of proposed amendments to the Land Division Code over the past few months. Some of the impetus for developing these standards came from past discussions with the Planning Commission, via other projects, in which the Commission raised concerns in this regard. Additionally, community comment and criticism over some existing residential development in the City in the past decade has also prompted this review. As a result, the Planning Commission asked Staff to further develop the Residential Design Review Standards and to bring them forward as a separate process. The attached document is DRAFT #2 of potential Residential Design Standards, specifically Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Residences and Duplexes. The attached DRAFT #2 has been amended from the version reviewed at the previous two work sessions based on comments from Planning Commissioners at the October 16<sup>th</sup> and November 4<sup>th</sup> meetings (the version reviewed at the previous two meetings was labeled as DRAFT #1). The amendments shown in DRAFT #2 are based on the specific direction from the Planning Commission, and the more general comments that the previous draft standards were too prescriptive and/or restrictive. The amended draft text is shown in **blue for new or relocated text**, and ~~red strikethrough for previously proposed text that will be omitted or has been relocated~~.

### Background:

As part of the Land Division Code text amendment considerations, the residential designs standards listed in Attachment A were initially discussed by the Planning Commission and staff. The rationale for these draft standards was the same as those that prompted the amendments to the Land Division Code. That rationale being:

*Over the past few years, as economic decline has plagued many communities, Redmond was hit especially hard with a large number of foreclosures, empty homes and undeveloped subdivisions. Many of the empty homes and undeveloped subdivisions are now in a state of disrepair and are undesirable for new development or rehabilitation for a variety of reasons – a primary reason being the lack of physical amenities and design elements that make neighborhoods attractive and desirable. A key component to ensuring that new development results in neighborhoods where people want to live, where property values are maintained and*

Attachment: Attachment A – DRAFT #2 - Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes  
Attachment B – Revisions to Section 8.3040 (4), Downtown Overlay District Design Review Criteria, Procedure

*that become assets to the community, are the rules governing land divisions (including infrastructure design) and the attractiveness of the ensuing residential homes.*

During the discussion with the Planning Commission on the Land Division Code, future administration of the requirements by City staff was a primary consideration. Both the Planning Commission and staff recognized that although the single family residential design elements were important in achieving overall neighborhood sustainability, attractiveness and desirability, the Land Division Code was not the proper place for the inclusion of such regulations for appropriate future applicability related to their intent. Accordingly, single family residential construction occurs sometimes weeks, months or years after the subdivision is developed and platted, and there is no legal means to apply the provisions of the Land Division Code to the home construction at that time. Therefore, the Planning Commission directed staff to pursue the residential design standards through a separate amendment process following on the foot-heels of the Land Division Code. The Planning Commission made a formal recommendation on the revised Land Division Code to the City Council at their September 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the City Council has now had one work session on that recommendation. The Residential Design Standards as proposed in Attachment A are now being brought forward for Planning Commission consideration.

*Planning Commission Discussion at October 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting* - At the work session on October 16<sup>th</sup>, the Planning Commission reviewed the Draft Standards in Attachment A and made some initial recommendations. Those are not yet reflected in the attached draft (all changes directed by the Planning Commission will be included in their final recommendation), but are listed below:

- Section 8.0141 (1) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(A) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]**. The initial discussion debated whether or not to move this entire subsection to the “Fence” section of the Development Code. Ultimately, the direction was to leave this section, but to include additional text amending this section to clarify that the required screening (screened from view) shall be based on “ground level sight line on all sides.”
- Section 8.0141 (2)(C)(1)(p) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(B)(3)(p) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]**. There was discussion regarding what was intended by “decorative trellis or trelliswork.” The discussion included a suggestion that such trelliswork should be integral to the construction and not merely affixed as an element that can be removed. However, a final suggestion in this regard was not decided upon.
- Section 8.0141 (2)(E)(2) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(B)(5)(b) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]**. The Planning Commission directed eliminating the text of this subsection which required that garage doors be setback a minimum of 5 feet from the front of the façade of the dwelling facing the primary access street. In turn, the Planning Commission recommended that new text be inserted at this location to reflect their recommendation to the City Council in a separate but related action (as related to street width provisions in the Land Division Code). The Planning Commission intended that the new text at this location would provide direction that no vehicular access shall be allowed to 24 foot wide streets. Notwithstanding this direction from the Planning Commission, the City Council adopted the revised Land Division Code with specific a provision that prohibits driveway access to any 24 foot wide streets (streets less than 28 feet wide) unless specific on-street parking requirements are met, except that all streets 300 feet or less in length are prohibited from having driveway access. The text in Attachment A has been amended to reflect the direction from the Planning Commission as affected by the action of the City Council when the Land Division Code amendments were adopted.
- The Planning Commission noted at the October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting that were additional issues that they wanted to discuss regarding the draft text (without specificity), but indicated they would like to do so at their next meeting (at the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting).

*Planning Commission Discussion at November 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting* – At the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Planning Commission discussed the overall basic rationale of whether or not the proposed Residential

Attachment: Attachment A – DRAFT #2 - Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes  
Attachment B – Revisions to Section 8.3040 (4), Downtown Overlay District Design Review Criteria, Procedure

Design Standards should be implemented. This discussion was initiated based on Commissioner comments indicating that the standards as proposed were too prescriptive, limited personal property rights, could drive up home prices, and would potentially limit unique and compatible architectural design that would be assets to the community. As a result of this discussion, the Planning Commission began to re-review the draft standards in a section-by-section manner to look for ways to overcome potentially overly prescriptive/restrictive standards. Mid-way through the review, the Commission forwent further re-review of the draft code and asked staff to provide information about how residential design standards were implemented in other communities. Notwithstanding, the forgoing of the review of the standards, there was a great deal of discussion on the following sections of the draft provisions:

- Section 8.0141(2) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(B) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]** – Building Design (including subsections A, Architectural Design; B, Roof Design; and, C, Wall Design). During this discussion, the Planning Commission was in general agreement with subsection A, which requires multiple home designs on lots within close proximity to one another (to avoid “cookie cutter” homes/neighborhoods). With regard to subsections B and C, the Planning Commission debated a variety of issues, including: the prescriptive nature of requiring architectural features; the limiting nature of the architectural elements; the overall number of elements required for roofs and walls; the additional cost that such requirements could add to homes; and, if such requirements were implemented, the ability to opt out of the prescriptive requirements and rely on a discretionary architectural design review process by/through the Planning Commission or other established body. Notwithstanding the acknowledgement that the prescriptive standards will provide a base level of architectural integrity, it was noted that a discretionary design review process would potentially allow a multitude of architectural designs beyond the prescriptive requirements and would allow other issues such as cost and overall neighborhood character to be addressed. Lastly, it was discussed that a discretionary design process would need to be based on “intent” or “purpose” statements which give guidance to what is trying to be achieved.
- Section 8.0141(2)(E) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(B)(5) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]** – Driveways and Garages. Among the five subsections included within this section, the Planning Commission previously directed Staff to omit subsection 2 regarding the garage door setback from the front façade (see notes under October 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, above). The primary point of discussion among the remaining four subsections was subsection 5, the requirement that any conversion of a garage to living or other space be replaced with a new garage which complies with the remaining provisions of this section. The concern was that this was too limiting and would prevent homeowners with smaller lots from utilizing the garage for business or other necessary purposes on the basis that they could not replace the garage as required (there may not be adequate room on the lot for the replacement garage). In turn, Staff notes that elimination of this requirement would bring into question the requirements of subsections **a** and **d** – which state that a garage is required for each dwelling unit, along with some design standards for such. In short, if a replacement garage is not required when a garage is converted (meaning that a home is left with no on-site garage), the requirement to construct a garage with each dwelling unit would be superfluous to require in the first place. Subsequently, design standards for garages would not be warranted either. Thus, the overriding issue for Planning Commission discussion is whether or not a garage should be required with each dwelling unit, or if a minimum number of off-street parking spaces must be constructed and maintained for each dwelling, whether provided via a garage or driveway only. The current parking requirement listed in Section 8.0500 of the City of Redmond Development Code requires two (2) “off-street parking spaces” per dwelling unit for single family dwellings and duplexes (interpreted to include an off-street driveway, without a garage).
- Section 8.0141(3) **[now Section 8.0141(5)(C) in Draft #2, Attachment A to this Staff Report]** – Site Landscaping. There was a Planning Commission comment that site

Attachment: Attachment A – DRAFT #2 - Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes  
Attachment B – Revisions to Section 8.3040 (4), Downtown Overlay District Design Review Criteria, Procedure

landscaping should not be a requirement of the code. However, this was not debated in full by the Planning Commission and no direction on this issue was provided.

### **Discussion:**

As stated above, at some of the initial work sessions with the Planning Commission on the Land Division Code, various residential design standards were discussed (i.e. landscaping, fences, screening of mechanical equipment, building architectural elements). These standards, which include requirements for various elements mentioned above, are proposed to be addressed and added as a new section of the Development Code that immediately follows the existing Residential Design Standards - Section 8.0140, Table B, Minimum Design Standards – among others. The new section is proposed to be located and entitled as Section 8.0141, Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes (see Attachment A).

The primary elements of the proposed standards include:

- Mechanical Equipment Screening
- Residential (single family dwelling and duplex) Building Design (architectural elements)
- Site Landscaping
- Fences

The basic rationale for each of the elements listed above as addressed in the attached draft code were addressed in previous staff reports to the Planning Commission for the October 16<sup>th</sup> and November 6<sup>th</sup> meetings – they are not repeated herein. Rather, the primary issue discussed at the November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (the rationale for Residential Design Standards and the methods of implementing such standards is addressed below.

*Design Standards / Code Options* - While preparing the draft standards, staff reviewed a variety of existing codes from communities around Oregon as well as other states. There are two primary methods by which residential design review is conducted, these include: 1.) Prescriptive architectural requirements; and, 2.) Discretionary architectural guidelines. Notwithstanding these two separate methods, some jurisdictions provide a combination of the two.

- Prescriptive architectural requirements – This method of directing architectural design is done by specifically listing and requiring a variety of elements, themes, and/or styles. The degree of specificity can vary to include a wide selection (list) of acceptable elements, themes or styles to be used in combination, which does allow a degree of architectural freedom and expression, or it can be very limiting with few options allowed. In any combination, this method provides a base level of predictable outcomes of varying degrees of certainty. This method is fairly easy to administer and provides more certainty in the process for both the applicant and the reviewer. It is considered a “development action” and is not necessarily subject to the prior noticing requirements under Oregon land use laws. Thus, the review timelines and process would be rather expeditious and less costly.
- Discretionary architectural guidelines – This method of directing architectural design is more reliant on the overall intent or purpose statement of what is desirous (what is trying to be achieved), and recognizing that there may be many ways of meeting the intent or purpose. This method is very reliant on strong intent and/or purpose statements being included in the development code which give dependable guidance to the review body. The strong statements add continuity to the review body approach for each separate review, but still allow freedom to accept a variety of designs. This method employs the subjectivity of the reviewer and is less predictable than the prescriptive requirements. Additionally, because it is discretionary in nature, it typically relies upon a review “body”, such as the Planning Commission or other body appointed for such purpose. Under Oregon land use law, this method constitutes a land use action (which requires public notice and is appealable). Typically this method is more time consuming and is a costlier process.

Attachment: Attachment A – DRAFT #2 - Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes  
Attachment B – Revisions to Section 8.3040 (4), Downtown Overlay District Design Review Criteria, Procedure

The standards included in the attached draft are intended as Prescriptive architectural requirements that are non-discretionary standards which are clear and objective – which are considered development actions and not subject to the requirements of land use actions under State land use law. The proposed standards have considered the concerns of the residents of Redmond, while attempting to employ many of the best elements obtained from staff research to address the resident concerns in a clear and objective manner. The intent was to include standards that were easy to understand and administer, and which were cost effective and less time consuming, while achieving a desirable result.

As referenced above, there is the option of utilizing both methods of architectural review. In one method (Prescriptive review), an easy to understand process with measurable, desirable results can be employed (as has been proposed). As an option, builders/owners who desire alternative designs can apply for the Discretionary review path and demonstrate how they meet the intent and purpose of the standards. In an effort to provide the Planning Commission with this option for consideration, new text had been included in Draft #2 (Attachment A) attached to this report. These are shown in blue, and are included as new text regarding Procedure and Exception as listed in Sections 8.0141(2) and (3), respectively.

**Alternative Courses of Action:**

Approve the draft standards as proposed by Staff or as modified by the Planning Commission, or continue to work with Staff to revise the draft text through subsequent work sessions while also beginning the public involvement process.

**Recommendation/Suggested Motion:**

Not applicable.

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

**I. RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS – existing/proposed/amended proposed**

**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	F	F
Multi-family Complex	NA	NA		F	F
<b>Maximum Density (1 unit per # s.f.)<sub>F</sub></b>				3,000	2,500
<b>Minimum Setback Distance<sub>C,F</sub></b>					
Front	15	15	15	15	15
Interior Side	B 5/10	B 5/10	B 5/10	B 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<sub>F</sub></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 which 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.					

**8.0141 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STANDARDS FOR SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS AND DUPLEXES**

1. Purpose. The purpose of the Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes is to promote and sustain:
  - A. High quality development throughout a variety of housing choices;
  - B. A diversity of individual styles that incorporate positive design characteristics throughout the City; and,
  - C. Excellence in architectural design that:
    1. Enhances the visual environment and character of the community;
    2. Preserves and protects property values, as well as public and private infrastructure investment;
    3. Conveys a sense of balance, integrity and character among all neighborhoods throughout the City; and,
    4. Elevates the attractiveness and quality of life in Redmond.
2. Intent. The intent of the Architectural Design Standards for Single Family Dwellings and Duplexes is to:
  - A. Maintain flexibility for a variety of architectural style to be developed throughout the City;
  - B. Establish a basis for architectural character for each dwelling, regardless of architectural style;
  - C. Continue to allow innovations in design that recognize emerging technologies such as solar and wind power, telecommunications, and environmentally conscious construction methods;
  - D. Provide an integral relationship between the quality of the dwelling and the quality of the public and private infrastructure of the neighborhood; and,
  - E. Promote quality design characteristics that will enhance the long-term desirability of the dwelling, neighborhood and community as an attractive place to live.
3. Procedure. New single family dwellings and duplexes, or any alterations thereto, constructed on lots in subdivisions platted after the effective date of this ordinance shall be reviewed for conformance with the requirements listed in this Section, subject to the procedures outlined below.:
  - A. Track 1. Conformance with Section 8.0141(5), below. An application demonstrating conformance with Section 8.0141 (5) shall be submitted to and reviewed by the Community Development Director or designate. Conformance with the objective standards included in Section 8.0141(5) shall be shown on the architectural plans submitted with the application. Such application shall be processed as a Development Action pursuant to Article 2 of the City of Redmond Development Code, Land Use Procedures.
  - B. Track 2. As an alternative to the procedure for Review as a Development Action as listed in Section 8.0141(3)(A) above (in cases where the proposed design does not, or the applicant chooses not to comply with the requirements of Section 8.0141(5)), an application may be submitted to the Community Development Director which demonstrates conformance with the Purpose and Intent of this Section as listed in Sections 8.0141(1) and (2), above. The individual provisions of subsections (1) and (2) shall serve as discretionary review criteria, and shall be addressed by the applicant in writing and shown on the

architectural plans submitted with the application. Such application shall be processed as a Land Use Action pursuant to Article 2 of the City of Redmond Development Code, Land Use Procedures. In cases where a Public Hearing is required, the Hearings Body shall be the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission.

4. **Application and Approval Process.** The applications for either a Track 1 or Track 2 review as specified in Sections 8.0141(3) (A) and (B) above, shall be submitted prior to or in conjunction with an application for a building permit. Building permits will not be issued until the review action is completed and approved by the City. The application shall be submitted on a form prescribed by the City with an accompanying fee.
- ~~4.~~ **5. Architectural Design Standards.** Although specific architectural styles (i.e. craftsman, colonial, tudor) are not mandated, single family dwelling and duplex design shall conform with the following standards:
  - A. **Screening of Mechanical Equipment and Trash Storage Areas.** All exterior **ground mounted** mechanical equipment ~~and trash storage areas~~ shall be entirely screened from view **on all sides at the ground/eye level line of sight** by a sight obscuring fence or wall, with such fences or walls being maintained in perpetuity. **Solar power, wind power, satellite dish or other equipment necessitating placement on walls or roofs for normal operation are exempt from this provision.**
  - ~~2.~~ **B. Building Design.** ~~Single family dwelling and duplex design on lots in subdivisions platted after the effective date of this ordinance shall promote design that will protect neighborhood character, protect property values, protect public and private investment and enhance the attractiveness and quality of life in Redmond. The residential design principles included herein are intended to ensure that new residential development contributes to the architectural and visual qualities of the neighborhood. Although specific architectural styles (i.e. craftsman, colonial) are not mandated, the following residential design principles shall be required for all new single family and duplex dwellings:~~
    1. **Architectural Design.** In order to discourage the appearance of tract-type housing, a separation by at least three (3) lots on either side and across the street by 2 lots in each direction is required for single family dwellings and duplexes with the same or very similar design when viewed from the street frontages. The same or very similar designs are those which consist merely of mirror image floor plans, or exterior elevations of the same basic design which utilize different colors, materials or ornamentation.
    2. **Roof Design.** **Most architectural styles utilize a related set of roof elements that compliment and help establish the overall style and character of a dwelling. Because the roof is a primary feature and key component of a dwelling that contributes greatly to the overall architectural style and character of the dwelling, A** a minimum of three (3) roof design elements shall be used on all four elevations of the structure. Roof Design Elements include:
      - a. Pitched or sloping roof;
      - b. Variations in roof pitch, height of roof planes or roof orientation;
      - c. Dormer, such as hipped, gabled, shed or eyebrow dormer design
      - d. Eave of at least 12 inches;
      - e. Overhang of at least 6 inches with bargeboard or vergeboard; and

- f. Gable end elements (window, decorative vent door, decorated verge boards, trusses, false beams, corbels, brackets, or other decorative elements in gable ends)
3. **Wall Design. Most architectural styles utilize a related set of façade features, details and finishes that define the overall character of a dwelling. The most attractive designs work within the established style and incorporate an appropriate mix of multiple façade elements to achieve a base degree of style recognition. Because an appropriate number and mix of wall elements is fundamental to achieving and establishing style and character, A a minimum of five (5) four (4) wall design elements shall be used on the side and rear elevations of the structure, and seven (7) five (5) elements on the front elevation. Multiple siding treatments are highly encouraged. Wall Design Elements include:**
- a. Recessed entry;
  - b. Covered porch at least 36 square feet, with a minimum 4 foot depth
  - c. Balconies enclosed by railing or parapet;
  - d. Vertical offsets, at least two, either projecting or recessed at least 6 inches deep and a minimum of 4 feet long;
  - e. Horizontal offsets, at least two, either projecting or recessed at least 5 inches deep;
  - f. Column or pilaster, either complete or engaged;
  - g. Engaged tower, with the design being square, rectangular, circular or polygonal in form;
  - h. Bay window, box window, or box bay that projects at least 6 inches outward from the wall plane;
  - i. Window trim or surround (casing) at least 3.5 inches wide that completely surrounds the window;
  - j. Windows with grids, multi-paned sashes, or that are of elliptical, round, arched, semi-circular or similar design;
  - k. Shutters, as a matched pair for windows, either fixed or movable;
  - l. Variation in wall cladding, wall surface pattern or decorative materials;
  - m. Decorative garage doors, with or without windows, including patterning relief at least 5/8" deep over the door surface;
  - n. Band course, band molding, belly band, belt course or similar horizontal element the entire length of the façade of relatively slight projection;
  - o. Exterior chimney of brick, stone, composite, masonry or other similar materials; and,
  - ~~p. Decorative trellis or trelliswork~~
4. **Front Door.** A front door that is visible from the public street frontage (front yard) and a sidewalk between the front door and the public sidewalk is required. Front porches, including covered front porches, are highly encouraged.
5. **Driveways and Garages.**
- a. A garage is required for each dwelling unit and shall be of adequate size to accommodate a minimum of one vehicle, and shall at a minimum meet the design requirements in Section 8-

0500 through 8.0515 (Parking Table and Diagram) of the City of Redmond Development Code.

- b. ~~Garage doors shall be setback a minimum of 5 feet from the façade of the dwelling facing the primary access street, and shall be setback a minimum of 20 feet from the lot or parcel line.~~ **Driveway access to any street less than 28 feet wide shall be in conformance with Section 8.2710 (3)(Table 1), of Article 3, the City of Redmond Land Division Code.**
  - c. Driveways, whether accessed from a public or private street or alley, shall be of adequate size to accommodate a minimum of one vehicle, and shall at a minimum meet the design requirements in Section 8.0515 (Parking Table and Diagram) of the City of Redmond Development Code.
  - d. Notwithstanding Section 8.0141 (2) (E) (1, 2 and 3) above, all garages and driveways accessed directly from public or private streets or alleys less than 36 feet in width shall be sized to accommodate a minimum of 2 cars based on the parking space design standards listed in Section 8.0515 (Parking Table and Diagram) of the City of Redmond Development Code.
  - e. No garage as required by this subsection shall be converted to living or other space unless a replacement garage complying with the standards of this subsection is provided.
3. **C.** Site Landscaping. All single family dwelling and duplex residential lots shall have landscaping on all sides of the structure which consists of lawn, trees, shrubs, native vegetation (a combination thereof). Such landscaping shall be maintained in good condition, with irrigation provided as necessary, with dead and dying vegetation removed. Landscape plans which demonstrate compliance with this requirement shall be submitted with building plans for each individual lot.
4. **D.** Fences. Fences constructed in conjunction with any single family dwelling or duplex (including fences constructed by the developer of a subdivision as perimeter fences) shall be in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 8.340 of the City of Redmond development Code.



**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 2

**DATE:** November 6, 2012  
**TO:** Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission  
**FROM:** James J. Lewis, Senior Planner, Long Range/Economic Planning  
**SUBJECT:** Fence Standards – Work Session

---

### **Report in Brief:**

This is a work session to discuss draft text amendments for the regulation of fences. This discussion was initiated as part of the overall discussion with the Planning Commission regarding residential design elements during the review of proposed amendments to the Land Division Code over the past few months. Part of the impetus for this discussion rose from community comment and criticism over some existing fences constructed in the City, specifically fences associated with new residential development. The attached document is a first DRAFT of potential amendments to the existing Fence Standards contained in Section 8.0340 of the City of Redmond Development Code.

### **Background:**

As part of the Land Division Code text amendment considerations, the need for revised residential designs standards was discussed by the Planning Commission and staff. One of the discussion items in this regard was fences – specifically fences constructed with new residential development (either as part of the overall subdivision design by the developer, or individually by the builder/homeowner). It was specifically noted that fences have a very significant contributing effect to the overall character of the neighborhood, and, ultimately, how the neighborhood contributes to the character of the City.

During the discussion with the Planning Commission on the Land Division Code, future administration of the requirements by City staff was a primary consideration. Both the Planning Commission and staff recognized that although design elements such as fences were important in determining neighborhood character, the Land Division Code was not the proper place for the inclusion of such regulations for appropriate future applicability related to their intent. Accordingly, fences are many times constructed years after the lot is platted, and there is no legal means to apply the provisions of the Land Division Code to the fence construction at that time. Therefore, the Planning Commission directed staff to pursue these standards through a separate amendment process following on the foot-heels of the Land Division Code.

### **Discussion:**

As stated above, at some of the initial work sessions with the Planning Commission on the Land Division Code, residential design standards were discussed – one of the included elements was fences. These standards include both new and amended provisions to the existing Code listed in Section 8.0340 (see Attachment A). The attached draft includes **proposed new text as red**, with ~~omitted text in strikethrough~~.

Some of the primary concerns with existing fence designs include: 1.) fences constructed as continuous, unbroken expanses along the City arterial and collector streets; 2.) fence materials and construction methods; and, 3.) fence size by location. The primary amendments included in Attachment A for each of the items listed above is described below.

1. Continuous, unbroken expanses - All fences constructed along the side and rear lot lines will be required to incorporate other architectural elements such as stone, brick, rock, or similar products every 16' in length. Generally this includes columns or posts spaced every two standard fence sections that are constructed with these materials.
2. Fence materials and methods – Fences constructed along public streets are required to be constructed of wood, vinyl or wrought iron only – chain link fences are not permitted. All fences are required to be constructed of solid materials that are able to be painted and maintained to be structurally sound, and are required to be maintained in a structurally sound condition and be free from exposed nails, screws, loose members, decaying materials or other similar conditions that can pose a hazard.
3. Fence size and location - Fences located in front yards will have a maximum height limit of 3 ½ feet. The overall height limit for all fences in Residential zones (only) is reduced from 8 feet to 6 feet (the fence height limit in all other zones will remain at 8 feet).

The overall intent of these standards is to maintain a property owner's ability to construct a fence for the purpose of privacy, security, animal restraint, and other typical factors. However, the proposed amendments are intended to ensure that such fences compliment rather than detract from the character of the neighborhood and community. It places more stringent requirements for those property boundaries fronting public streets regarding materials and aesthetics, but less stringent restrictions on areas where fences are not readily visible to the public. Nonetheless, because specific standards have been added concerning construction and maintenance, the overall affect of fences on livability and neighborhood aesthetics will be enhanced.

**Alternative Courses of Action:**

Approve the draft standards as proposed by Staff or as modified by the Planning Commission, or continue to work with Staff to revise the draft text through subsequent work sessions while also beginning the public involvement process. Notwithstanding the alternatives for this amendment process, the architectural standards for single family residences and duplexes will be processed separately but concurrent as part of the overall amendment process for residential design standards.

**Recommendation/Suggested Motion:**

Not applicable.

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

**FENCE STANDARDS - EXISTING and PROPOSED****8.0340 Fences**

- ~~1. In any residential zone, a fence, lattice work, screen or wall, other than a retaining wall, not more than six feet in height may be located in any required front yard, and no more than eight feet in height in any required side or rear yard. Provided however, in those areas designated for clear vision, the restrictions set forth in Sections 8.0305-8.0310 shall apply. (Revised 6/98) (Note: the International Building Code indicates that fences in excess of six feet in height require a building permit, and may need to be professionally engineered).~~

All fences constructed after the time of the adoption of this ordinance shall comply with the following standards. For the purpose of these standards fences refers to fences, lattice work, screens or walls (other than a retaining wall).

The intent of these standards is to ensure that fencing contributes positively to the appearance of the community, and that the scale, location, and appearance of fencing does not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or public safety. With this intent, these standards are designed to minimize long, uninteresting, blank walls along streets and roadways.

1. In all Residential Zones and the Urban Holding Zone, all fences shall be developed to the following standards:
  - A. Fences abutting or adjacent to a public street shall comply with the following:
    1. Fences in front yards, and in that portion of side yards extending from the front property line to the front façade of the dwelling, shall be a maximum of 3½ feet tall and constructed of wood, vinyl or wrought iron only. Chain link fences are not permitted.
    2. Fences in that portion of side yards extending from the front façade of the dwelling to the rear property line, and all rear yards, shall be a maximum of 6 feet tall and constructed of wood, vinyl or wrought iron only. Chain link fences are not permitted.
    3. Fences located in side and rear yards shall incorporate other architectural elements such as stone, brick, rock, or similar products every 16' in length (See: *Examples*).
    4. Other types of fences (allowed to the 6 foot height limit) may be approved by and at the discretion of the Community Development Director subject to compliance with the intent statement above.
  - B. Fences not abutting or adjacent to a public street shall comply with the following:
    1. Fences located in the side or rear yards shall not exceed 6 feet in height, unless otherwise approved through Variance pursuant to Section 8.0700 of this Chapter. (Note: the International Building Code indicates that fences in excess of 6 feet in height require a building permit, and may need to be professionally engineered).

- C. No fence in any residential zone, except as exempted by Section 8.0340 (5) below, shall be constructed with barbed wire, razor wire, or similar apparatus.
2. In ~~a C-4~~ all Commercial Zones (except for the C-2, Central Business District Zone and the Mixed Use Zones), ~~any~~ the PF-Public Facility Zone, the Park Zone, and in ~~both~~ any Industrial Zones, all fences shall be developed to the following standards:
- A. The maximum height of a fence shall not exceed 8 feet. (Note: the International Building Code indicates that fences in excess of 6 feet in height require a building permit, and may need to be professionally engineered). ~~Provided however, in those areas designated for clear vision, the restrictions set forth in Sections 8.0305-8.0310 shall apply. (Revised 6/98)~~
3. For any development undergoing land use review, any wood or vinyl fence bordering a street ~~exceeding a span of 25' in length~~ shall incorporate other architectural elements such as stone, brick, rock, or ~~varied usage of wood~~, similar products every 16' in length (See: *Examples*).
4. All fences, regardless of zone or location, shall comply with the following requirements:
- A. Fences fronting public streets shall provide one gate, opening, or other site access for emergency services use. For corner lots, only one opening along the either the front or side yard frontage is required.
- B. Fences shall not block the clear vision area and shall comply with the standards in RDC Section 8.0305.
- C. Fences shall be constructed on private property, and shall not be located in public rights of way.
- D. Fences shall be comprised of wood, vinyl, metal or other solid material that is able to be painted and/or maintained in structurally sound condition. All fences shall be maintained in a structurally sound condition and be free from exposed nails, screws, loose members, decaying materials or other similar conditions that can pose a hazard.
4. 5. The following fences shall be exempt from ~~height~~ the ~~restrictions~~ standards set forth herein, ~~except for the requirement to comply with the clear vision standards in RDC Section 8.0305, as listed in Section 8.0340 (4) (B) above:~~
- A. Any security fencing around a public or quasi-public utility or entity including the Airport perimeter.
- B. Fences related to a park or school use including (but not necessarily limited to) tennis courts, driving ranges and ball fields.
- C. Fences necessary for compliance with any documented Federal or State mandated requirements (i.e. Homeland Security requirements)

~~C. D.~~ Any fence exempted under ~~(4)~~ (5) (A and B) herein that is in excess of 20 feet in height shall require conditional use permit review and approval, and a public hearing.

~~5.~~ At no time shall fence heights exceed 4' when the fence fronts a public road or street.

~~6.~~ Fences fronting public streets shall provide one gate, opening, or other site access for emergency services use.

*Examples:*





**DRAFT**

## **Exhibit 4**

716 SW Evergreen Avenue  
Redmond, OR 97756-2242

**CITY OF REDMOND**  
Community Development Department

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, November 6, 2012

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

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Eric Porter, Vice Chair Anne Graham, Bob Bleile, Bea Leach, Katie McDonald (2 positions vacant)

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

**Visitors:** Sharon Harris, *Interim City Manager*

*(scribe CP's note: The minutes were created from notes taken at the meeting. The three digits after the motion title shows the number of Commissioners 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. Dry Canyon Master Plan-Update

Ms. Richards said that City Council adopted the North Central Near-Term Utilization Plan in 2011. Mr. Brooks will facilitate update of the 1984 Dry Canyon Master Plan which will include as much public involvement as possible.

Mr. Brooks summarized the review process. Feedback will be sought from citizens and other stakeholders on long-term strategies for park programming and development in the Dry Canyon plus property ownership and an acquisition strategy. He requested a Planning Commissioner volunteer to serve on the Liaison Committee. Liaison Committee members will also include the Parks Commission, Redmond Development Commission, Redmond Area Park and Recreation District (RAPRD), Redmond School District, and Redmond Parks Foundation. The Liaison Committee is expected to meet at least two times in the next six to eight months, starting in January 2013.

Commissioner concerns included *Mr. Brooks' work program, funding park development, and RAPRD boundaries*. Vice Chair Graham and Commissioner Leach volunteered to serve on the Liaison Committee.

##### B. Residential Design Standards – Architectural Design Standards for Single-Family Residence

Mr. Lewis presented his staff report, summarizing the history of this issue and Commissioner discussion from the October 16, 2012, meeting. He is noting recommendations for text changes at each work session and will print a new draft when Commissioners finish their edits.

Ms. Richards reminded Commissioners that City Council has requested the Planning Commission consider how Redmond can avoid cookie-cutter subdivisions. Staff will continue to research how other communities address this issue.

Commissioner McDonald expressed concern over the need for these standards (overall) in the first place. She stated that the proposed code text was too prescriptive, did not respect property owner rights, and added costs that drive up home prices.

Chair Porter stated that these comments were a re-visitation of the basic policy question of whether or not to add such provisions, which was discussed and decided upon by the Commission at its previous meeting. Commissioners continued discussing the philosophy of such provisions, agreeing with some of the points raised by Commissioner McDonald.

Mr. Lewis stated that the draft code provisions were intended to ensure that basic architectural elements were constructed with each home, but not to be so prescriptive as to direct architectural style of the homes, that is, to allow architectural freedom to the homeowner as long as a minimum number of architectural elements was included.

Commissioner McDonald indicated that the intent of avoiding "cookie-cutter" homes in a neighborhood could be met without being so prescriptive if the provisions were limited to Section 8.0141(1) and (2)(A).

Commissioner Graham disagreed, saying that more specific provisions should be included and that the provisions were not overly restrictive as drafted.

Commissioners debated whether or not Commissioner McDonald's issues could be addressed through a section-by-section review of the draft code. After some deliberation on this issue, the Commission agreed to delay such a discussion, pending more information from staff as to the variety of ways in which other jurisdictions address these concerns.

#### C. Fence Standards

Postponed until tree standards are addressed.

#### D. Development Code Text Amendment – Link Noncompliance with Development Code to Redmond City Nuisance Code Chapter 5

Ms. Richards summarized the background of this issue and the code enforcement process. Voluntary compliance averages 92%. The purpose of this amendment is to give the City the ability to abate noncompliance with the Development Code more effectively and to bill a noncomplying property owner in order to recover City expenses.

**By consensus**, Commissioners recommended scheduling a public hearing on the proposed amendment.

#### **IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)**

#### **V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion 1** (4/0/1): Commissioner Graham moved to approve the October 16, 2012, minutes as written. Commissioner Leach seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Bleile,

Graham, Leach, and Porter voting in favor and Commissioner McDonald abstaining due to her absence from that meeting.

**VI. STAFF COMMENTS**

Ms. Richards reported that Mr. Lewis is the new Planning Manager. A new associate planner has been hired. Staff will be working to create a flowchart of all approved plans in order to capture historical data.

**VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Leach requested information on how to deal with squatters. Ms. Richards recommended that she report the matter to Code Enforcement.

**VIII. ADJOURN**

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 20, 2012.

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

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

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Porter, Chair