



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen
PO Box 726
Redmond, OR 97756-0100

(541) 923-7721
Fax: (541) 548-0706
www.ci.redmond.or.us

STAFF REPORT

TO: City Council

FROM: Jim Hendryx, Community Development Director
Nick Lelack, Planning Manager
Wayne Sorensen, Senior Planner

DATE: July 11, 2006

RE: **Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Amendments**

BACKGROUND

The purpose of the memorandum is to brief City Councilors and for the July 11, 2006 joint public hearing with the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners; at that time, the Council and Board will consider a series of amendments to expand the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Although this is a joint public hearing, the City Council and Board of County Commissioners will consider separate ordinances amending their jurisdictions maps, plans and codes.

City Council

The City Council will consider and approve, approve with modifications or deny the following legislative actions:

- Comprehensive Plan Map, which includes the UGB
- Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments
- Transportation System Plan Map
- Framework Plan
- Development Code Amendment to include a new Urban Holding-10 zoning district

Deschutes County Board of Commissioners

The Deschutes County Board of Commissioners will consider and approve, approve with modifications or denial of the following legislative actions:

- Comprehensive Plan Map
- Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments
- Transportation System Plan Map
- Title 20 – Redmond Urban Area Zone Map
- Title 20 – Redmond Urban Area Zoning (UH-10), eliminate other zones

UGB Expansion Criteria

The City continues to base its recommendation on the criteria below, established by the State of Oregon, and Redmond City Council and Planning Commission:

1. Compliance with State Statutes

State statutes direct communities to expand their urban growth boundaries based on land suitability (ORS 197.298) criteria. For Redmond, these criteria identify the Redmond Urban Reserve Area (RURA) as the number one land type in ORS 197.298 selection hierarchy; and compliance with locally adopted selection criteria for taking land from RURA. In addition, the boundary location is determined based on the Goal 14: Urbanization criteria:

- a) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs
- b) Orderly & economic provision of public facilities and services
- c) Comparative environmental, energy, social & economic (ESEE) consequences
- d) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural & forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB

2. Local Criteria

- a) 2,000 +/- acre UGB expansion to accommodate 20-years of projected growth based on Redmond Urbanization Study
- b) Transportation
 - o Create arterial backbone (west side corridor)
 - o Disperse traffic along the west side of the city rather than consolidate traffic in specific area
- c) Sewer
 - o Complete west side interceptor
 - o Gravity flow
- d) Schools / public facilities
- e) Jobs / housing balance

DISCUSSION

The matrix on the next page summarizes the Urban Area Planning Commission (UAPC) and Deschutes County Planning Commission's recommendations.

	UAPC		Deschutes County	
	RECOMMENDATIONS			
	Approve	Deny	Approve	Deny
Comprehensive Plan/UGB Map Option 1	X		X	
	In UGB	Out of UGB	In UGB	Out of UGB
Amendments to Option 1				
Elliott Property		*	X	
Far West Property Owners		**	***	***
Hall Properties	X		X	
Catlin: Elkhorn Avenue right-of-way		X		X
Russell 4-acre parcel (north)	X		X	
Russell 7-acre parcels (south)		X		X
	Approve	Deny	Approve	Deny
Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments	X			
Findings to Support UGB Amendment	X		X	
City Transportation System Plan Map	X			
County Transportation System Plan Map			X	
City Framework Plan	X			
Redmond Development Code (UH-10)	X			
Deschutes County Title 20 Amendments			X	
Deschutes County Title 23 Amendments			X	

* The amendment failed on a 3-3 vote.

** The UAPC's amendment failed for the lack of a second to the motion to approve.

*** The Deschutes County Commission voted 3-2 to recommend the City Council and Board of County Commissioners to consider the Far West Property Owners separate amendment.

KEY ISSUES

1. UGB Acres

The proposed 2,162 acre UGB amendment has been based on a GIS map. However, a GIS map is only a graphic representation of parcel lines while a survey measures exact land area. The initial survey indicates the UGB amendment is actually about 2,200 acres excluding portions of right-of-ways along specific streets. Thus the actual acreage of the UGB amendment will be in excess of 2,200 acres. The survey will determine the exact amount and will be completed in time for the Council's and Board's decision. City staff has notified County and State staff about this differentiation, and they will accept the higher UGB acreage based on the survey as long as the findings support it. City staff will prepare supplementary findings to support this higher number based on public facilities, topography, etc.

2. Far West Property Owner Amendment

Several issues have come over the past week regarding the Far West Property Owners separately proposed 168.5 acre UGB amendment. These issues include:

- The Urban Area Planning Commission did not recommend approval of the Far West Property Owners separately proposed UGB amendment because the motion to recommend approval failed to receive a second.

- Upon evaluating the Far West Property Owners' findings, County planning staff testified on June 22, that the average annual growth rate cited in their report for Year 2026 differs from Redmond's URA population forecast that estimated the amount of land needed by Year 2050. Consequently, the different growth rates results in higher population, housing unit, and acreage counts.
- Mark Radabaugh, Central Oregon Region Representative for the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), sent a letter to the City of Redmond and Deschutes County dated June 30, 2006 stating,

“We view the Far West Redmond Property Owners proposal as a separate UGB expansion effort since it is based on a separate and different analysis than that proposed by staff and the joint planning commissions. As a separate and significant UGB expansion proposal, the department should receive notice or at least an amended notice pursuant to ORS 197.610. We have no record of such notice.

We recommend that the FWRPO proposal not be included with the current proposal, but instead be given the option to provide an application through regular city procedures for such privately initiated applications following local adoption and state acknowledgement of the joint planning commissions' proposal.”

In light of these recent discussions, city staff now has strong concerns about the Far West Property Owner's separately proposed UGB amendment.

3. Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

One of the proposed text amendments to the Comprehensive Plan is to require a minimum of 200 acres for **privately** initiated UGB amendments, as stated in Chapter 14 Urbanization, Policy 8:

“The City and County will favor UGB additions that are of sufficient size and scale to be integrated into the urban area as complete neighborhoods or other community elements rather than isolated individual parcels. Privately initiated requests for UGB amendments should include a minimum of 200 acres and shall be based on demonstrated land needs to maintain a 20 year supply of urbanizable land within the UGB.”

City staff proposed this text amendment and the Planning Commission recommended approval. However, in light of the recent developments with the Far West Property Owner's proposed second amendment, City Council may decide to lower this minimum acreage to 150 acres to allow the property owners to propose a private UGB amendment of 168.5 acres.

4. City Council / Board of County Commissioner Discussion and Decisions

On July 11, the City Council and County Board will consider public testimony at the public hearing. Following public testimony, the Council and Board may choose to close or keep open to a date certain oral and written testimony. Whether the record is left open or closed, staff recommends the City Council and County Board jointly discuss the proposed UGB map and attempt to reach a consensus, if possible, on the map. The reasons for this discussion and attempt to reach consensus is that this direction will allow staff to finalize the survey of the UGB and expedite the conclusion of the UGB amendment process.

If the Council and Board are unable to reach consensus, staff recommends the Council and Board schedule a separate meeting to resolve differences as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the following:

1. Attempt to reach a consensus with the Board of County Commissioners on the Comprehensive Plan / Urban Growth Boundary Map.
2. If necessary, continue the public hearing or meeting to a date certain depending on the public testimony and ability to reach a consensus with the County Board.
3. Approve UAPC Comprehensive Plan/UGB map recommendations, which include:
 - Approve Option 1 UGB map with the following amendments:
 - a. Do not include Elliott property because of a 3-3 vote
 - b. Do not approve separate Far West Redmond Property Owner UGB amendment; city, county and state staffs recommend this amendment should proceed through a separate quasi-judicial (private) UGB amendment process
 - c. Include the Hall properties in the UGB
 - d. Do not include the Catlin request for the additional Elkhorn Avenue right-of-way
 - e. Include Russell's north 4-acre parcel, and do not include the south 2 parcels
4. Approve Comprehensive Plan text amendments, with the 150 acre requirement for privately initiated UGB amendments
5. Approve the Transportation System Plan Map
6. Approve the Framework Plan by Resolution
7. Approve the Redmond Development Code Amendment to include the Urban Holding-10 Zone District