



**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)

**URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Work Session – City Hall Conference Room A**  
**716 SW Evergreen Avenue**

**Tuesday, June 21, 2011**  
**7:00 PM**

**Agenda**

**UAPC**  
**Members**  
Eric Porter,  
Chair  
  
Will  
Van Vactor,  
Vice Chair  
  
Tory  
Allman  
  
Bob  
Bleile  
  
Stan  
Clark  
  
Katie  
McDonald  
  
John  
Nastari

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. CITIZEN COMMENTS**
- III. WORK SESSION (Exhibit a)**  
**Mixed Use Live Work (MULW) –**  
**Planning Commission Discussion following**  
**Initial Public Hearing on June 7, 2011**
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Exhibit b)**
  - a. April 19, 2011**
  - b. May 3, 2011**
  - c. May 17, 2011**
- V. COUNCIL LIASON COMMENTS (if present)**
- VI. STAFF COMMENTS**
- VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- VIII. ADJOURN**

\*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

EXHIBIT A-

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)

**DATE:** June 21, 2011  
**TO:** Redmond Urban Area Planning Commissioners  
**FROM:** James J. Lewis, Senior Planner, Long Range Planning  
**SUBJECT:** MULW Work Shop – as follow up to Public Hearing on June 7, 2011

---

**Report in Brief:**

On June 7, 2011 the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft Text of the proposed Mixed Use Live Work (MULW) Zone and Mixed Use Live Work - Special District Overlay (MULW-SD) Zone and the application of those zones to the subject area. Based on testimony presented at the public hearing, the Planning Commission continued the public hearing to July 5, 2011, and scheduled a work shop for June 21, 2011 to discuss the issues raised at the previous public hearing.

The primary comments raised by the public and discussed by the Planning Commission centered around three areas:

1. Inclusion of the R-4 zoned residential area within the overall proposal – changes to the residential character of the area;
2. The ability to continue to construct new, stand alone single-family residences within the MULW zone; and,
3. The ability to construct stand alone offices within limited areas and at limited sizes within the MULW zone.

**Public Comment:**

The public comments included both proponents and opponents to the proposal. Their primary comments are summarized as follows:

*Proponents* – The proponents were all in favor of the proposed code text as proposed, but some suggested that the uses should be expanded to allow stand alone offices. The proponents did have the understanding that the Planning Commission previously discussed this issue very specifically and decided against allowing stand alone offices in the zone. Rather, office uses must be tied to (incidental and subordinate to) a primary use that would otherwise be permitted in the MULW zone. On this basis, the comments to add stand alone office uses were qualified by the suggestion that they could be limited by size (i.e. 1,200 to 2,500 square feet), by location (on lots fronting Evergreen Avenue or 9<sup>th</sup> Street), or by a combination of both. Comments were also made that office uses would be the most likely near term development options in this area, and that such development along the arterial corridors would stimulate other development (with other uses permitted in the MULW zone) within the core of the subject area.

*Opponents* - The opponents were not necessarily opposed to the overall creation of the MULW zone, or the application of the new zone to the M-1 or M-2 industrial areas. Rather, their concerns were that by applying the new zoning standards to the R-4 zoned areas and allowing businesses to develop within the area currently developed primarily with residential uses, there would be increases in traffic

and crime, and parking problems. It was stated that these impacts would be derogatory to livability and change the overall character of the neighborhood.

Further, the opponents had concerns about the ability to construct new single-family homes on vacant lots (including new lots that could be created) within the area currently zoned R-4 (currently the R-4 zoned area allows single-family homes as an outright permitted use – the M-1 and M-2 areas do not). The new MULW zone that would be applied to the R-4 area would allow existing single-family homes to continue as an outright permitted use (including replacement thereof) in perpetuity. However, the construction of new single-family homes on vacant lots would be prohibited. However, new residential development within the R-4 area would be allowed under the new MULW zone as part of a live/work unit (a residence of 200 square feet or larger could be constructed as long as it had an attached portion of at least 600 square feet that was reserved for business uses).

Neutral Statement – A neutral statement in terms of either being a proponent or opponent of the proposal was provided concerning the inclusion of stand-alone offices in the MULW zone. That statement indicated that such uses have led (in similar situations elsewhere) to increases in property values to industrial zoned land (the primary uses in the MULW zone are still primarily industrially oriented), which have made the use of such lands for true industrial uses cost prohibitive.

### **Staff Comment:**

History - The creation of the MULW zoning text, and the application of the new zone to the subject area, came at the direction of the Planning Commission as part of their 2010 work plan (discussions regarding the subject area actually began in 2009). When added to the work plan and initiated, the intent of the proposal was to effect change to an area that was underutilized – the primary purposes stated by the Planning Commission were to beautify and revitalize the eastern gateway to Redmond (the Highway 126/Evergreen Avenue corridor and surrounding area). Additionally, a goal for the proposal was to stimulate new economic and physical development in the area while acknowledging the historic uses. The proposed draft text and map evolved over the course of 2010 through Planning Commission discussion and consensus.

Issues – The issues listed above are discussed below.

1. R-4/Residential Area - The desire to acknowledge and allow the continuation of existing uses, while at the same time generating a necessary change, is difficult to accomplish - this was a primary Planning Commission discussion point throughout this project. The comments by the opponents at the public hearing are aimed specifically at this point – that the allowable new uses/development, and the restricted uses (as compared to what was otherwise allowed in the R-4 zone), would cause substantial changes within the subject area (more so within the R-4 zoned area). Their comments though are implying that the changes incurred would be deleterious to the neighborhood livability. In contrast, the comments by the proponents imply that the changes do not go far enough, and that the permissible uses should be expanded.

Discussion - The conflicting effect of the changes raised by public hearing participants must be weighed accordingly with the Planning Commission's original purpose and intent of the proposal. A primary deliberation point could be an evaluation of the expected short term development impacts to the neighborhood compared to the long term direction for the MULW zone. Inherent in this discussion is the expected timeframe for when any real substantive development is expected to occur. Also, the expected degree of development (size and scale) could also enter the discussion. It is the overall guidance to the future development pattern of the area that the MULW zone provides as related to the intent and purpose that is the pertinent discussion.

Overall, Staff believes that omitting the R-4 area from the zoning proposal and leaving it as is would slow the progression of the purpose and intent of the Planning Commission for the

MULW zone. The application of the MULW zone to only those areas that are currently zoned M-1 and M-2 would result in the R-4 area being further isolated from new development – beautification and revitalization would be much slower to occur within this area. Additionally, a stagnation and perpetuation of the historic development pattern in the R-4 area could have an adverse effect on the desirability of the adjoining former M-1 and M-2 zoned areas for new development. Lastly, with new development of the mixed use nature occurring in the surrounding areas to the east and west, the desirability for new and continued (long term) single-family residential uses in the R-4 area would be expected to decline.

2. Stand Alone Offices/Office Uses – The Planning Commission discussed this issue multiple times over the code development process. For discussion purposes during the process, staff brought examples of text that could be added to the code, including stand alone offices and offices as part of live/work units – some of those were discussed with limitations such as maximum square footage. Each time the issue was discussed, the Planning Commission rejected such inclusion in the code text. The rationale for not including office uses in some capacity was based on the effect it would have on: 1.) Drawing such uses away from the downtown core and other commercial areas; 2.) Potential traffic impacts and the effect on the traffic would have during the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis; and, 3.) Potential impacts (increases) in property values that make the area cost prohibitive for other industrially oriented uses allowed in the zone. Subsequently, the proposed text only allows office uses as part of a primary or otherwise permitted use within the MULW zone.

Discussion – The public comments which suggested allowing stand alone office uses, but limiting their development potential within the subject area (either by location or by maximum square footage) would most likely have the following results in the subject area: 1.) Would most likely have negligible effect on the traffic impacts (depending on the degree of limitation) - thereby not making the proposal non-compliant with the TPR; 2.) Would likely make those properties to which the office use were applicable slightly “higher in value” – although this is speculative without a true analysis; 3.) Would likely draw development to those properties for such uses sooner than if not allowed; and, 4.) Could create a stimulus to new development/re-development and rehabilitation of surrounding properties on the basis that history has shown that new development tends to breed additional new investment into the subject area. Impacts to other areas in the community where office uses are currently allowed (which was a primary concern of the Planning Commission) is somewhat unknown – however, potential impacts could be: 1.) A reduction in overall lease rates for commercial office space in Redmond (based on increase supply with a stagnant demand); 2.) A continued high vacancy rate within other commercial areas, such as the downtown core; and, 3.) Increases in the overall property values/prices within the area proposed for MULW zoning.

Overall, Staff believes that as drafted, the MULW zone, combined with the Special District Overlay, will allow a balance to be struck between maintaining many of the existing uses while allowing new uses that will result in changes occurring more slowly over time – this is in comparison/contrast to a new zone that did not acknowledge or allow existing uses to continue.

The Public Hearing was continued to July 5, 2011.

James J. Lewis  
Senior Planner, Long Range Planning



**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**

Monday, April 19, 2011

City Council Chambers

777 SW Deschutes Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chair Eric Porter, Tory Allman, Bob Bleile, Stan Clark, Katie McDonald, John Nastari

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Margie Dawson, *City Councilor-Liaison*

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

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

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

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

#### **II. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS**

Ms. Dawson reported that City Council unanimously passed the 12<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Downtown Urban Renewal District. Earth Day will be on April 23, 2011.

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

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

##### A. TA 11-01, Automatic Extension of Land-Use Approvals

Chair Porter read aloud the hearing procedures. No Commissioners disclosed ex parte contact or bias. Commissioner Bleile declared a potential conflict of interest in that one of the land-use approvals due to expire is his. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner. Chair Porter opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Ms. Richards introduced James Lewis, the City's new long-range planner.

Ms. Richards presented the staff report (Exhibit 1), summarizing the pros and cons of extending 23 land-use approvals to July 1, 2013. Lack of financing and extreme market depreciation has severely impacted Central Oregon's economy. City Council extended prior land-use approvals in August 2009 to July 1, 2011. Applications and decisions that would be affected by this automatic extension are consistent with Redmond's development code. Based on feedback from City Public Works and Engineering departments, this should be the last extension granted. The long-range forecast is that Redmond's economy will turn around in late 2012 or 2013. Extending the outstanding land-use permit approvals to July 1, 2013, will facilitate Redmond's recovery. Foregoing the \$884.68 cost for each extension will not mean a great difference in the Community

Development Department budget, but could create goodwill with developers who are currently strapped for cash. Determining ownership of some of these properties is complicated by the fact that several are in foreclosure. The City of Bend recently went through the same process. She has communicated (not by letter) with most of the affected parties. Several people asked about an extension but no one provided comments in opposition.

No one present in the audience offered testimony.

Following discussion, Chair Porter continued the hearing to May 3, 2011, to allow staff time to clarify the meaning of the following phrase in the last sentence of Redmond Development Code Article II, Section 8.1620: “. . . a land use permit to which a specific condition of approval that regulates the duration and terms of approval has been attached, or any other City issued permit that is not a land use permit are hereby excluded from this automatic extension of time.”

#### B. TA 11-03, Insurance Provisions – Daily Display Signs

Chair Porter read aloud the hearing procedures. No Commissioners disclosed bias or conflict of interest. Commissioner Clark reported talking to people who use daily display signs but did not feel his ability to hear this issue had been compromised. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner. Chair Porter opened the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Ms. Richards presented the staff report (Exhibit 2), summarizing current requirements of the Redmond Development Code and reasons for the proposed changes. The current permitting process is onerous for both applicants and City staff. The proposed changes have been reviewed by the City’s Risk Manager, insurance broker, and legal counsel.

Chair Porter closed the hearing to public testimony at 7:30 p.m. when no one offered comment.

**Motion 1** (6/0/0): Commissioner Clark moved to recommend that City Council approve TA 11-03, subject to correcting Redmond Development Code Section 8.4250(15) to read: “A sign permit application for a Daily Display Sign to be located on public property and/or public right-of-way shall be accompanied by a certificate of insurance showing that the owner has Commercial General Liability coverage as defined in the application, and that the insurance company shall notify the City no less than 10 business days prior to canceling the insurance policy.” Commissioner Nastari seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

#### C. TA 11-04, Redmond Historic Landmarks Commission

Chair Porter read aloud the hearing procedures. No Commissioners disclosed ex parte contact, bias, or conflict of interest. Commissioner Clark said that he owns a historic building that would be affected by the proposed amendment, even though it is not currently designated as historic, but did not feel this posed a conflict. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner. Chair Porter opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Ms. Richards presented the staff report (Exhibit 3), summarizing changes proposed to the Redmond Development Code which have been reviewed by the City attorney. If adopted, all land-use decisions pertaining to historic and cultural resources in the City of Redmond would be administered and evaluated by the Redmond Historic Landmarks Commission (established February 22, 2011). A good historic preservation program benefits include serving as a foundation for tourism, encouraging sustainability, promoting economic development, defining Redmond as a unique place, and raising awareness of local history. Once populated, the RHLC will review the development code and recommend amendments to the historic review process.

Commissioners recommended the following changes:

- \* Property owners should have veto power to “opt out” of a historic designation. The property owner needs to consent to the historic designation process prior to a hearing taking place.
- \* **8.0820:** The last sentence should read – “To that end, a program for the identification, evaluation, and designation of historic resources as landmarks and land-use regulations regarding the alteration, moving, or demolition of designated landmarks and historic resources **is** necessary.”
- \* **8.0825(3):** Clarify to prevent parallel jurisdictional conflicts.
- \* **8.0830(11)(D):** Add “tree” to the list of site examples.
- \* **8.0835:** Change title to “Designation of Historic Building, Structure, Object, Site, or District.”
- \* **8.0835(2):** Identify “who” will transmit the copy of the request to the RHLC.

Following Commissioner discussion, Chair Porter continued this hearing to May 3, 2011.

## V. WORKSHOPS

### A. Home Occupations – Definition of Retail

Ms. Richards requested more time for staff to research other communities’ definitions of retail.

**By consensus,** Commissioners postponed discussion of this topic to May 3, 2011.

### B. Signage – Flags

Ms. Richards said that City Council has requested Planning Commission review of how flags are handled in the Redmond Development Code and how they could be allowed in a safe manner. Flags used to identify or advertise a business are currently prohibited. Homeowners may display flags to the maximum height allowed in the residential zone. There are no regulations prohibiting residential use of flags. Of 18 recent enforcement cases involving flags, 14 have been resolved through voluntary compliance. She made a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed definitions of signs and flags. The City attorney’s legal opinion agrees with the current code and reasons for prohibition. Based on public safety and enforcement concerns plus research of how 15 other communities handle flags, staff recommend continuing to prohibit the use of flags as signs.

If City Council decides that flags can be used as signage products, staff recommend allowing only pole-mounted flags and requiring both a sign permit and a building permit in order to reduce signage clutter. Flags higher than 10 feet from the ground, whether or not mounted on a building, should be engineered for “flag drag” and permitted accordingly.

Ms. Dawson said that City Council wants to continue allowing holiday flags, i.e., 4<sup>th</sup> of July, and those mounted along the streets for special events.

Commissioners’ concerns included *double standards* (regulating some flags but not all), *known safety hazards*, *12-year accident history*, *code enforcement precedents*, and *reviewing proposed language to allow flags to be used as signs safely*. Following discussion, Commissioners agreed **by consensus** to recommend that the City continue to prohibit using flags as signs.

## VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Motion 2** (5/0/1): Commissioner Clark moved to approve the February 1, February 15, and March 15, 2011, minutes subject to making the following changes:

- \* February 1: Correct Section IV.A (Presentations), Paragraph 1, Sentence 1, to read: “Mr. Caccavano made a PowerPoint presentation to facilitate discussion on why the City needs to update its Public Works Standards and Specifications.”
- \* February 15: Correct “Chair Clark” to “Chair Porter” under Section I (Call to Order) and correct Section IV.B (Planning Commission Work Program), Paragraph 2, to read: “Chair Porter

asked about having the Rural Development representative from the U.S. Department of Agriculture make a presentation regarding grant and loan funding available to property owners in Enterprise Zones.”

\* March 15: No changes needed.

Commissioner Nastari seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allman, Bleile, McDonald, Nastari, and Porter voting in favor and Commissioner Clark abstaining.

**VII. STAFF COMMENTS**

Ms. Richards reported on the results of research prompted by Commissioner Nastari’s concern about the impact of fence heights on community aesthetics. Staff reviewed the current Redmond code, enforcement complaints, and how other communities handle this issue. The City has not been consistent in enforcing the four-foot maximum height of fences along public streets. About two-thirds of the community has six-foot fences, many of which were built subsequent to the change from six to four feet in 2006. Staff are discussing how best to communicate the change and encourage compliance.

**VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (None)**

**IX. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AND SIGNED BY ME  
THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

ATTEST:

---

Eric Porter, Chair



**DRAFT**

**CITY OF REDMOND**  
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue

Redmond, OR 97756-2242

Phone **541-923-7721**

Fax **541-548-0706**

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

## **REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes**

Monday, May 3, 2011

City Council Chambers

777 SW Deschutes Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Porter opened the meeting at 7:01 p.m. with a quorum present.

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

#### **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### A. TA 11-01, Automatic Extension of Land-Use Approvals

Chair Porter re-opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. No Commissioners disclosed ex parte contact, bias, or conflict of interest except for Commissioner Clark, who said he spoke to the Badger Subdivision folks across the street outside City Council Chambers on May 3, 2011. No one present challenged the qualifications of any Commissioner.

Ms. Richards presented the staff report (Exhibit 1), summarized the history of this issue, explained the application process, and addressed Commissioner concerns raised on April 19, 2011. If adopted, the amendment would automatically extend land-use approvals (previously extended from August 2009 to July 1, 2011) to July 1, 2013. The oldest land-use approvals that would be affected by this extension were first granted in 2006. Building permits will not be impacted. Extending the affected land-use approvals respects the considerable resource investment of the development community which has been unable to move forward with these projects due to Central Oregon's economic downturn. Foregoing the \$884.68 cost for each extension will not mean a great difference in the Community Development Department budget, but could create goodwill with developers who are currently strapped for cash.

Chair Porter said the City received a letter of support from John McClure, *Hillwood Capital*, and closed the hearing to further testimony at 7:09 p.m. when no one else offered comment.

**Motion 1 (7/0/0):** Commissioner Clark moved to recommend that City Council approve TA 11-01 as presented in the May 3, 2011, staff report. Commissioner Allman seconded the motion which

passed unanimously.

**B. TA 11-04, Redmond Historic Landmarks Commission** (continued from April 19, 2011)

Chair Porter re-opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m. No Commissioners disclosed additional ex parte contact, bias, or conflict of interest. No one challenged Commissioner qualifications.

Ms. Richards presented the staff report (Exhibit 2) and reviewed issues raised by Commissioners at the April 19, 2011, hearing. The intent of the amendment is to shift authority to hear land-use applications pertaining to historic resources from the Deschutes County Historical Landmarks Commission to the RHLC. The City attorney has reviewed the level of authority that the RHLC would have. Staff has added new language to the amendment that would require a property owner's prior approval before a historic designation process could be initiated.

Chair Porter closed the hearing to public testimony when no one offered additional comments.

In response to Vice Chair Van Vactor's concern that allowing property owners to veto historic designation would result in pockets of nondesignated properties within a historic district, Ms. Richards said staff is working on that issue. The City is working to qualify for federal grants by becoming a Certified Local Government. Once populated and trained by the State Historic Preservation Office, the RHLC will review the Redmond Development Code to recommend changes for Planning Commission consideration.

**Motion 2** (7/0/0): Commissioner Clark moved to recommend that City Council approve TA 11-04 as amended in the May 3, 2011, staff report. Commissioner Bleile seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Chair Porter passed the gavel to Vice Chair Van Vactor, pleading fatigue, and left the meeting.

Vice Chair Van Vactor closed the public hearing on TA 11-04 at 7:17 p.m.

#### **IV. WORKSHOPS**

**A. Mixed-Use Live/Work Zone**

Mr. Lewis presented the staff report (Exhibit 3) including new text to avoid unintended parking impacts and minimize impacts to public infrastructure and other properties. He recommended limiting size as a way to decrease noncompatible uses. The Oregon Departments of Transportation (ODOT) and Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) are concerned about traffic impacts. The City will conduct a neighborhood meeting on May 19, 2011.

Ms. Richards provided examples of existing structure sizes to facilitate discussion about the appropriate size of uses. ODOT is opposed to large retail uses due to concerns about trip generation and compliance with the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

In response to Vice Chair Van Vactor's invitation, John Schimmoller said he supported keeping uses flexible, allowing lot consolidation, allowing a caretaker dwelling unit for industrial uses, and setting a maximum size for retail uses in the live/work zone of 2,500 square feet.

Commissioner concerns included  *blessing every legal use that already exists, allowing a broad mix of uses, the danger of a "laundry list" of acceptable uses precluding a nonlisted use that would be appropriate for this zone, type and size of uses, lot sizes, lot consolidation, destination retail impacts on TPR compliance, public safety, limiting the live/work unit footprint, parking requirements, and how other live/work zones address size and parking issues.*

Ms. Richards said that staff will research/recommend language to address Commissioner concerns at the next work session before the June 7, 2011, public hearing.

Commissioner McDonald left at 8:45 p.m.

#### B. Home Occupations – Definition of Retail

Ms. Richards made a PowerPoint presentation and handed out a copy of the March 1, 2011, staff report to facilitate discussion of whether retail uses should be allowed in residential zones and, if so, what performance standards would be appropriate. City Council asked Planning Commission to review the Redmond Development Code to ensure that allowing home occupations does not abuse the intent of preventing retail businesses in residential zones. All communities researched define home occupations as a secondary use in a home that has minimal impact on the residential nature of the neighborhood. Most home occupations must be owned and operated by the resident. Measures employed to mitigate adverse neighborhood impacts included hours of operation, number of employees, types of uses, on-site parking, number of trips generated per hour or per day, number of days per year dedicated to retail sales, maximum floor area dedicated to business purposes, business license, and conditional-use permits. City staff are currently reviewing the application process for home occupations. Enforcement is triggered by a neighbor's complaint. Due to the economic downturn in Central Oregon, staff expect to see more entrepreneurial efforts.

Commissioners asked questions to clarify their understanding of how the City now administers home occupations. Discussion points included *defining commercial vehicles, how to allow more intensive home occupation use (2<sup>nd</sup> tier) without compromising residential integrity, revisiting the application process, compatibility of uses, and code models from other jurisdictions.*

Ms. Richards said staff will bring suggestions to the next workshop on this issue to address Commissioner concerns.

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

#### **VI. STAFF COMMENTS**

Ms. Richards said that the City is working with DLCD to bring a form-based zone workshop to Redmond in mid-June 2011. This approach looks at how a site is built out, rather than specific uses on the site. Staff are interested in how that approach could be incorporated into an existing zoning structure within Oregon land use law.

Ms. Richards requested a Planning Commission workshop to report on progress of the Central Oregon Regional Economic Opportunity Analysis (REOA). All jurisdictions within Deschutes, Jefferson, and Crook Counties have been working for the last year to determine how to bring large-lot industrial land into the Central Oregon inventory to respond to regional and statewide employment needs. Redmond has two sites that would be impacted: (1) 465 acres of Open Space Park Reserve within the city limits and (2) 900 acres south of the city limits owned by the Oregon Division of State Lands. A regional REOA forum will be held at the end of May 2011.

#### **VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (None)**

#### **VIII. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AND SIGNED BY ME

THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

ATTEST:

---

Eric Porter, Chair



**DRAFT**

**CITY OF REDMOND**  
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue

Redmond, OR 97756-2242

Phone **541-923-7721**

Fax **541-548-0706**

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

**REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Minutes**

Monday, May 17, 2011  
City Hall, Conference Room A  
716 SW Evergreen Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

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

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

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

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

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**II. CITIZEN COMMENTS (None)**

**III. WORK SESSION**

A. Mixed Use Live/Work Zone (continued from May 3, 2011)

Mr. Lewis summarized the staff report (Exhibit 1) which was based on his review of audio records for Commissioner discussion from the June 2010 workshops.

John Schimmoller said that the live/work component of the proposed new zone is exciting because of the potential for attracting new business to this area. Manufacturing concerns should be allowed to have a studio apartment.

Commissioner Clark presented his memo dated May 13, 2011, the subject of which was "MULW zone limitations to make it fit the Transportation Planning Rule" (TPR).

Additional Commissioner discussion points included *not limiting the work component of the live/work zone, requiring the home occupant to work in the business component of the live/work unit, and the relationship between business size and TPR compliance.*

Commissioner Clark left at 8:41 p.m.

Mr. Lewis said that staff will revise the draft language to include the changes requested by Commissioners during tonight's discussion. The City will conduct a neighborhood meeting on May 19, 2011. Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on June 7, 2011.

**IV. PRESENTATION**

**A. Central Oregon Regional Economic Opportunity Analysis**

Ms. Richards presented the staff report. Key points of her PowerPoint presentation included project summary, stakeholders, funding, barriers, potential solutions, basic methodology, determining need, REOA vision, regional competitiveness, community strengths and challenges, site need characteristics, regional large-lot designation and need inventory, Redmond's large-lot industrial analysis, local site readiness strategies, timeline for regional economic policies, and regional authority administration. A regional REOA forum will be held on May 24, 2011.

Commissioner concerns included *losing the current quality of life if an Intel-type company comes in and greater job creation potential with smaller manufacturers.*

**V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)**

**VI. STAFF COMMENTS**

Ms. Richards said that a form-based zone workshop will be held in City Hall on June 9, 2011.

**VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Chair Porter reported attending the Oregon Division of State Lands' meeting last week.

Commissioner Nastari and Chair Porter thanked staff for their input on the proposed Mixed Use Live/Work Zone.

**VIII. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Porter adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AND SIGNED BY ME  
THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

ATTEST:

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