



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

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

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
City Hall, Conference Room A, 716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Monday, September 15, 2014
6:00 PM
Agenda

**UAPC
Members**

**Evan
Dickens,
Chair**

**Dean
Lanouette,
Vice-Chair**

**David
Allen**

**Jennifer Cort
Youth Ex-Officio**

**Anne
Graham**

**Tom
Kemper**

**Lori
McCoy**

**Eric
Porter**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. August 4, 2014 (*Exhibit 1*)**
- III. CITIZEN COMMENTS**
- IV. WORK SESSION (*Exhibit 2*)**
 - 1. Livability Comprehensive Plan Amendments**
 - 2. Residential Design Standards Code Amendment**
 - 3. Signs and Electronic Billboards, Code Amendment**
- 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; click on City Government, hover on Commissions and Committees, click on Urban Area Planning Commission. You may also request a copy from City Records Office 923-7751 or email KellyM@ci.redmond.or.us

Anyone needing accommodation to participate in the meeting must notify Jodi Burch, at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at (541) 923-7735, 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.



DRAFT

CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

716 SW Evergreen Avenue
Redmond, OR 97756-2242

Phone **541-923-7721**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.ci.redmond.or.us

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes

Monday, August 4, 2014

Council Chambers, 777 SW Deschutes Avenue, Redmond, Oregon

Commissioners Present: Chair Evan Dickens, Vice-Chair Dean Lanouette, David Allen, Anne Graham, Tom Kemper, Lori McCoy, Eric Porter (absent:)

Youth Ex Officio: *Jennifer Cort* (absent)

City Staff: Heather Richards, *Community Development Director*; David Pilling, *Public Works*; Cameron Prow, *TYPE-Write II*

Visitors: Annette and Clarence Rosebrook, Bill and Liz Riley, Erika Gurley, Frank D. Smith, Gary and Carole Manners, Greg Madesh, Jan Painter, Jeff Steiert, Jerry and Jinny Andres, Jerry and Susan Hoffinger, Jim Donohue, Joanna Painter, John Pavlicek, Keith Erickson, Lennie Brant, Mark Smith, Mike Koepf, Pamela Lester, Pat Childs, Randy Shipley, Ron and Billie McElroy, Ron MacKay, Wayne Campbell, Wendy Soltys, William Turner

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dickens opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. with all seven commissioners present, establishing a quorum.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion 1 (6/0/1): Commissioner Graham moved to approve the June 16, 2014, minutes. Commissioner Porter seconded the motion which passed with Commissioners Allen, Dickens, Graham, Kemper, Lanouette, and Porter voting in favor and McCoy abstaining due to her absence from the June meeting.

III. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mr. Smith (2932 SW Cascade Vista Drive, Redmond) reiterated the concerns he expressed at the July 7, 2014, meeting about why a replacement antenna on the Verizon site on Forkhorn Butte was not required to have a City permit or land use review. He claimed that the Community Development Department allowed a neighboring property owner to convert his residential property to a purely commercial use, violating every known development code. He requested that the Planning Commission hold a hearing about the City's equally applying development standards across the board.

Chair Dickens said that Planning Commission did not have the ability to give Mr. Smith the remedy he was seeking and asked if he had sought legal counsel on this matter.

In response to Mr. Smith's question about the status of the AT&T application, Ms. Richards said an application is pending for a cell phone module on the light stands at Ridgeview High School.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Southwest Area Plan (SWAP), City File PA-14-2 – continued from May 5, 2014

Chair Dickens read aloud a statement summarizing the issue and the legislative hearing procedures. He said the entire record was available for public review and requested that testimony be limited to five minutes per person.

Commissioner Porter disclosed a potential conflict, stating that his cousin testified at a prior hearing on this matter but said he felt unbiased and could make a fair decision.

None of the other commissioners disclosed new (since May 5, 2014) prehearing contacts, ex parte conversations, or conflicts of interest. No one in the audience challenged any commissioner for bias, prejudice, or personal interest.

Chair Dickens continued the public hearing on City File PA-14-2 at 7:13 p.m.

Ms. Richards acknowledged concerns received since the City's public notice of the August 4, 2014, hearing including a letter from John and Lois Holmes and an e-mail from David Pilling, City Engineering Office, regarding transportation and stormwater drainage. She explained what the SWAP will and will not do. She stated the SWAP's purpose was to direct development within the Redmond urban growth boundary (UGB) at urban-level densities in a planned and orderly manner, and with the provision of an adequate level of urban services including, but not limited to, public water, sewer, and urban streets. She summarized (PowerPoint) staff-recommended changes to this plan following the May 5, 2014, hearing which included but was not limited to removing the mixed-use neighborhood (R4) zoning at the intersection of Helmholtz and Wickiup Avenues, identifying the potential for parks, removing the trail from the existing golf course, and amending maps to include the city limits, UGB, urban-rural area designation, and existing golf course and to change the color of the mixed-use zone. She said the SWAP will not rezone any land without the owner's approval but will provide a rezoning basis if an owner wants to pursue this option. The City and Planning Commission will continue to work together to protect the neighborhood's quality of life while providing more commercial and urban services.

Chair Dickens invited additional public testimony.

Annette Rosebrook, 65376 Old Bend-Redmond Highway, Bend, said she and her husband owned 32 acres east of Ridgeview High School. She stated their support for the SWAP and said affordable housing is needed.

Gary Manners, 3345 SW 43rd Street, Redmond, questioned the right-of-way width of Wickiup, viewshed protection on the west side of the butte, and whether there will be a bus-only lane on 43rd. Mr. Pilling said Wickiup's right-of-way was 60 feet. Ms. Richards said all zones have height limits to address massing but not viewsheds specifically. She stated that the land use decision for the high school specifies that only busses can access the school where 43rd comes into the property, but 43rd is a local street that will serve everyone.

Randy Shipley, 2575 SW Greens Boulevard, Redmond (owner, The Greens), thanked the City for taking the trail out of the golf course. He said the State is purchasing property along Highway 97 for a frontage road, just bought the nursery, and has offered to buy 12 feet of his property that is adjacent to the nursery. He asked about City plans for this area and whether there will be an overpass at Elkhorn. Ms. Richards responded that the Elkhorn overpass and the frontage road are included in the City's transportation system plan, which the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has acknowledged. Mr.

Shipleigh noted that the Rosebrooks' property is being purchased and will be redeveloped as multi-family housing.

Chair Dickens recommended that Mr. Shipleigh contact the City to confirm the redevelopment potential of the Rosebrook property.

Greg Madesh, 3355 SW 47th Street, Redmond, expressed concern about his liability if the public walking on a trail along the canal. He asked how a trail could run down the irrigation canal which is posted as "Private Property" and whether the canal will be covered. Ms. Richards said the City will have to achieve easements with private property owners in order to build trails per the City trails master plan. Central Oregon Irrigation District owns an easement for its ditch-rider road, so no development can happen there, making it a possible trail location.

John Pavlicek, opajohn@bendbroadand.com, said he is buying the Rosebrook property to have control over what is built there and does not intend to put multi-family units next to The Greens. Ms. Richards said multi-family housing is a conditional use in the R4 zone.

Gary Manners requested clarification on zoning for the northwest corner of the SWAP. Ms. Richards said that area would be developed according to a 2006 land use decision; existing land use decisions cannot be altered by the SWAP.

Pat Childs, 3800 SW Helmholtz Way, Redmond, expressed concern about the six roads and two irrigation canals that will cut through her property according to the map. She recommended letting the developer decide where roads go. Ms. Richards said the City Fire and Police Departments like roads to be built on a grid system, but that roads indicated on the map are not cast in stone.

Wayne Campbell, 4675 SW Yew Avenue, Redmond, asked if the State is selling the Forked Horn Subdivision and whether access to the property will change after the sale. Ms. Richards explained how the State sells surplus property. She stated that the transportation network will continue to evolve as new phases of this subdivision come online.

With no further testimony offered, Chair Dickens closed the public hearing on File PA-14-2.

Commissioner concerns included impact on the high school of removing the MUN zoning from the Helmholtz/Wickiup intersection, long-term plan for Wickiup, adding location of the urban-rural interface to the Planning Commission work plan, connecting new parks to schools and trails, and adding The Greens golf course to the Project Area map. Commissioner Porter pointed out that the Helmholtz/Wickiup intersection was not part of the SWAP but was included in the City's transportation system plan. He thanked audience members for their input.

Motion 2 (6/0/0): Commissioner Graham moved to recommend the revised Southwest Area Plan (PA-14-2) to City Council for approval. Commissioner McCoy seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Richards said Council consideration of this matter was tentatively scheduled for September 9, 2014.

Chair Dickens thanked citizens for their participation in the review process.

V. COUNCIL LIAISON COMMENTS (None)

VI. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Richards discussed agenda items for the next meeting which will include development code clean-ups. The next big project will be the Redmond Community Revitalization Action Plan. She said the City will provide transportation and per diem (meals) for commissioners who attend the next Planning Commissioner training session, and noted that Chair Dickens would be attending.

VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chair Dickens thanked Ms. Richards and her staff for their work in the SWAP process and their responsiveness to the community.

VIII. ADJOURN

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 18, 2014, 6 p.m.

With no further business, Chair Dickens adjourned the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2014.

ATTEST:

Evan Dickens, Chair



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

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

EXHIBIT 2 – Work Session STAFF REPORT

DATE: September 15, 2014
TO: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
FROM: Deborah McMahan, Principal Planner
THROUGH: Heather Richards, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Proposed Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments.

Report in Brief:

This is a continuation of the work session from August 18, 2014. At that work session the Planning Commission discussed proposed amendments for the Comprehensive Plan adding a chapter on Livability Goals and Policies for the City of Redmond that support the City's mission to create and maintain community livability, as well as proposed Development Code Amendments for Residential Design Standards and Signage Standards.

The Planning Commission asked staff to revise the proposed amendments for further consideration at its September 15, 2014 meeting. This staff report summarizes those revisions and the draft proposed amendments. This work session will review the proposed amendments and provide direction for future development code and comprehensive plan amendments to consider at a public hearing.

Background:

Development Code and Comprehensive Plan revisions or "tune-ups" will occur periodically throughout the year when the public, council, commissions, and staff note where certain changes are needed. Staff will endeavor to be mindful of the Commission's time and agenda schedule and thus, we will group code revisions by theme as much as possible. Some items may carry over to several meetings.

Residential design review is one item that will likely require several meetings. The City Council recently asked that the Planning Commission consider a different approach. At the Redmond City Council public hearing on July 22, 2014, to consider the Planning Commission's proposed development code amendments to the Residential Design Standards and the Fence Standards, the City Council voted to adopt the proposed amendments, but also directed city staff to work with the Planning Commission on some additional proposed amendments to the Wall Design and Roof Design standards of the code that would provide a baseline minimum standard of housing construction in Redmond and would require additional value-added elements that have "enduring" (20 years and more) architectural value to the facades.

This new approach will require a baseline of primary elements and design features followed by flexible secondary elements. City Council believes homes should have features that provide enduring value of at least 20 years. This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and visioning statement #67 - *Affordable housing that retains its value over time...* Staff has provided a draft of the new design

review language for you to review further in this report. Please feel free to call us with any questions so that we may have time to prepare any additional data and have it ready for the meeting.

The topics we hope to cover over several work sessions and hearings include:

- Livability
- Signs
- Design Review
- Master Planning
- Subdivisions and Planned Unit Development
- Implementation of the Redmond Development Plan and community visioning
- Minor Development Code Changes – addressing, typos, chart changes, home occupation, etc.

Discussion:

Topic #1 – Livability

The mission of the City of Redmond is to create and maintain community livability. The vision of the City of Redmond is that the City of Redmond will be a model for Northwest communities by being innovative in the creation of a high quality of life, ample family wage jobs, and a safe environment in which to raise and educate families. Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan and Development code refer to livability as a desired goal and a primary driving force in decision-making. Yet, there is no specific definition of what livability means for our community. Moreover, it will become increasingly important to craft land use decision “findings” that determine whether a project has addressed livability in their designs and developments. To do this, we need a definition, goal statement, and companion policies.

The following Comprehensive Plan amendments are offered for your review. **Red** text is new code language and ~~strike through~~ is deleted language. Those policies that are followed with a (*) are adopted goals and polices in the Redmond Development Plan, April 2012.

Chapter 15 LIVABILITY ELEMENT

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the “Livability” goals and policies that the City of Redmond will use to guide and manage growth. It is important to define livability and set specific goals and policies so that community aspirations can be met over the life of the plan.

Livability Definition:

Livability is a term used to describe the variety of surroundings and human experiences that shape Redmond and convey an image of a future that is enduring, vibrant, responsible, and offers a desirable quality of life. Community livability also refers to actions that improve the City’s ability to respond to changing social, economic, or environmental events.

Livability Goal:

The City of Redmond shall create and maintain livability. The City of Redmond shall guide development and support community identity and pride by implementing policies that improve livability and are innovative creating a high quality of life, ample family wage jobs, and a safe environment in which to raise and educate families.

Livability Policies:

- 1. Redmond shall plan and invest in the community to provide a high quality of life for both current generations of residents and businesses and future generations of residents and businesses.**
- 2. Redmond shall plan and invest in neighborhoods that provide a high quality of life for residents incorporating the Great Neighborhood Principles in both existing neighborhoods and new neighborhoods.**
- 3. Redmond shall create well-balanced and aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing types for all income levels. (*)**
- 4. Redmond shall adopt urban planning and building design strategies that create a positive and lasting first impression. (*)**
- 5. Redmond shall support energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.**
- 6. Redmond shall strive to be the safest city in the state. (*)**
- 7. Redmond shall plan to become an interconnected community of parks and open spaces. (*)**
- 8. Redmond shall plan for a variety of transportation choices.**
- 9. Redmond shall plan for and promote attractive streetscapes free from clutter, confusion, and blight. (*)**
- 10. Redmond shall develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health. (*)**
- 11. The City of Redmond shall develop and maintain the environment that promotes and supports a strong, healthy, and diverse economic base. (*)**
- 12. Redmond shall promote economic competitiveness through sustainable choices for housing, transportation, education, cultural diversity and enrichment, and recreational opportunities as well as improve reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services, and other basic needs by workers.**
- 13. Redmond shall help existing businesses within the City to grow and thrive. (*)**
- 14. Redmond shall help to create and foster new businesses of all types. (*)**
- 15. Redmond shall provide well-planned and maintain high-quality infrastructure to provide a competitive advantage for business and community growth. (*)**
- 16. Redmond shall work to educate, attract and retain a highly educated, skilled, and competitive workforce capable of fulfilling a variety of 21st century employer needs. (*)**
- 17. Redmond shall improve community aesthetics; strengthen its identity and sense of place by recognizing and enhancing its unique cultural and environmental resources (e.g.,**

historic structures, improved viewsheds, urban landscape, authenticity, heritage, and architectural styles). (*)

18. Redmond shall provide diverse family friendly entertainment for all Central Oregon residents and visitors. (*)

19. Downtown Redmond shall offer diverse districts with mutually supportive functions, including a pedestrian focused core that attracts residents and visitors for entertainment, shopping, dining, civic activities, and community events.

20. Redmond shall develop strategies that improve diversity of systems and reduce the potential negative impact to the whole city of the failure of any one particular system. Increasing the diversity of systems means that Redmond should maximize the diversity of different business types, institutions, sources of food, and industries, etc.

Topic #2 – Residential Design Review

What a residential development looks like says a lot about the community and its residents. Thus, a new homes image should contribute to the community and attract homebuyers who might otherwise choose to live in a different City with better neighborhoods. Over the past year, the City of Redmond has completed research, citizen involvement, and subsequently updated its development code to implement design review for residential structures. By applying design review to residential developments the City has the opportunity to provide positive, constructive direction to development within its jurisdiction. Design review can save time, facilitate a positive response to community concerns about development proposals, and most importantly, achieve higher-quality designs and more livable communities.

The impetus for design review was the influx of recent residential development that negatively changed the character of some of the City's neighborhoods. The City has found that how a residence looks is critical to its acceptance within the community and to the "pride of place" it creates among residents. Design review helps to avoid homes that are repetitive and appear like one large, undifferentiated mass with little variation.

The City's initial approach was to develop a list of exterior house element choices. However, the list is not producing the variety and visual desirability intended. Developers are not required to meet a basic minimum to achieve a baseline of performance. Recently, several of the local developers asked for changes to reduce the type and number of house elements. This further hinders the objective to provide improved housing.

The City Council has raised new concerns about residential design review and has asked for an approach that requires basic housing elements as a standard for new homes. This is a more effective approach and would require a baseline of "Primary Elements" such as covered front door entrances, recessed garages, wall treatments on all sides of the home, windows, and variation in rooflines and wall cladding. The "Secondary Elements" provide a variety of choices where the developer only has to pick two elements.

In each case, the developer may wish to provide more design elements, which is encouraged. The Community Development Director may approve elements that are not on the list and allow exceptions.

The revisions will need to be publically noticed, a hearing held by the Planning Commission and a recommendation forwarded to the City Council.

The following Development Code amendments are offered for your review. **Red** text is new code language and ~~strike through~~ is deleted language.

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 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 designee. Conformance with the objective standards included in Section 8.0141(5) shall be shown on the architectural plans submitted with the building permit application and administered as part of the plan review process. These applications are reviewed administratively by City of Redmond Planning Staff.
 - 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 provision 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. These applications are reviewed administratively by City of Redmond Planning Staff, unless the Community Development Director determines that a public hearing is necessary, in which case the application will be reviewed to the Hearings Body. **The Community Development Director may also approve other design element approaches and options not in this section, exceptions, or uniquely identifiable house styles provided they comply with the intent of this section.**

C. Design Review for Manufactured and Mobile Homes: Some manufactured homes and mobile homes may not be able to comply with the requirements above. In those cases, an application may be submitted to the Community Development Director, which demonstrates conformance with the intent of this section. Manufactured and mobile home construction by their nature may preclude structural changes. In these cases, the addition of a covered porch and deck areas may be appropriate as well as earth-tone paint, decorative wall treatments, band courses, changes in wall siding, and additional tree plantings. These applications are reviewed administratively by City of Redmond Planning Staff, unless the Community Development Director determines that a public hearing is necessary, in which case the application will be reviewed by the Hearings Body.

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 **design** 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.
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 areas shall be entirely screened from view on all sides at the ground/eye level line of sight by either utilizing a sight obscuring fence or wall, with such fences or walls being maintained in perpetuity or sight obscuring landscaping at least three (3) feet in height at installation. Solar power, wind power, satellite dish or other equipment necessitating placement on walls or roofs for normal operation are exempt from this provision, excluding all HVAC equipment.
 - B. Building Design.
 1. Architectural Design. In order to discourage the appearance of tract-type housing, a separation by at least two (2) lots on either side, and directly across the street 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 elevations. This also includes mirror image elevations not substantially modified by use of paint, materials or ornamentation. The Community Development Director or designee shall be allowed to interpret what constitutes the same or very similar designs.
 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 minimum of three (3) roof design elements shall be used on all four elevations of the structures. Roof Design Elements include:
 - a. Pitched or sloping roof;
 - b. Variations in roof orientation;
 - c. Variations in roof pitch, and/or height of roof planes ~~or roof orientation~~;
 - d. Dormer, such as hipped, gabled, shed or eyebrow dormer design
 - e. Eave of at least 12 inches;
 - f. Overhang of at least 6 inches with bargeboard or vergeboard; and,

- g. **At least five (5)** gable end elements such as windows, decorative vent cover, decorated verge boards, trusses, false beams, corbels, brackets, or other decorative elements in gable ends, **molding, rake, fascia and cornice return treatments.**
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. ~~A Because an appropriate number and mix of wall elements is fundamental to achieving and establishing style and character.~~ **The required and optional wall elements are listed below:**
~~a minimum of four (4) wall design elements shall be used on the side and rear elevations of the structure, and five (5) elements on the front elevation. Multiple siding treatments are highly encouraged. Wall Design Elements include:~~
In addition to the elements in a-e below: a minimum of five (5) elements shall be used on the front elevation and four (4) wall design elements shall be used on the side and rear elevations of the structure. Multiple siding treatments are highly encouraged; **use of T-111 is discouraged.**
- a. **40% fenestration of the front façade and 20% fenestration on the sides and rear facades to include windows, doors, louvers, vents, wall panels, skylights, curtain walls, and glazed systems, etc.**
- b. Window trim or surround (casing) at least 3.5 inches wide that completely surrounds the window;
- c. Band course, band molding, bellyband, belt course or similar horizontal element that runs the entire **width** of the front façade of relatively slight projection; **and at the break of the second floor and at the line made by the lower roofline at the gable end**
- d. Variation in wall siding ~~cladding~~, wall surface pattern or decorative materials; **the area above the highest band course must contain a different siding material than the area below the band**
- e. Band course, band molding, bellyband, belt course or similar horizontal element that entire width of the side and rear façades of relatively slight projection; **and at the break of the second floor and at the line made by the lower roofline at the gable end**
- f. Recessed or covered front entry at least 20 square feet, with a minimum 4 foot depth **measured from the front door and including decorative columns and railings. Plain support columns, such as undecorated, single 4" x 4" posts are not allowed.**
- g. Bay window, box window, or box bay that projects at least 6 inches outward from the wall plane;
- h. **Under-window planter box unit that is designed to accommodate live plants and watering/drainage**
- i. Windows with grids, multi-paned sashes, or windows that are elliptical, round, arched, semi-circular or similar design;
- j. Shutters, as a matched pair for windows, either fixed or movable;
- k. Balconies **of at least 2 foot depth and 5 feet in width, accessed by a door and** enclosed by railing or parapet;

- l. Decorative garage doors, with or without windows, including patterning relief at least 5/8" deep over the door surface;
- m. Vertical offsets, at least two, either projecting or recessed at least 6 inches deep and a minimum of 4 feet long;
- n. Horizontal offsets, at least two, either projecting or recessed at least 6 inches deep;
- o. Column or pilaster, complete or engaged; engaged tower, with the design being square, rectangular, circular or polygonal in form;
- p. Exterior **wall (or portion) and/or** chimney of brick, stone, composite, masonry or other similar materials; and,
- q. Garage located at the same plane as the front façade, behind the front façade, or behind the home.**
- r. 1 ½" caliper tree in front landscape area, in addition to required street trees**
- s. 1 ½" caliper tree in rear landscape area**
- t. Covered entry feature over secondary doors**
- u. Covered rear patio or porch**
- v. Eave greater than 12 inches in depth**

Topic #3 – Signs

The current sign code contains a variety of restrictions meant to eliminate distracting and unsightly illumination of signs and billboards. Staff believes the current code language needs to be clarified given the potential for using certain aspects of new digital technology to light signs and billboards.

This is consistent with Comprehensive Plan community visioning statement #9 regulating sign size and design; #11 elimination of billboards; and, the concepts contained in the Redmond Development Plan related to seeking creative solutions to improve the overall aesthetics of existing arterial and collector street corridors.

The following code modification is offered for your review and discussion. **Red** text is new code language and ~~strikethrough~~ is deleted language.

8.4110 Prohibited Signs. The following signs are prohibited:

- 1 Signs that use valances, propellers or similar wind activated or attention attracting devices. These devices when not part of any sign, but on the premises where a sign is utilized, are similarly prohibited unless they are permitted specifically by other legislation.
- 2 **Signs** that contain or include or are illuminated by any flashing intermittent revolving, rotating or moving lights or moves or has any animated moving parts; however, this does not apply to traffic control signs or signs providing public service information such as time, date, temperature, **and weather or similar information.**, ~~nor does it apply to the normal rotation of Trivision style billboards approved in compliance with Sections 8.4240 and 8.4245~~ **This prohibition also applies to electronic, digital, liquid crystal diode, light emitting diode, motion signage, rotating louvers, and similar digital technologies for new billboards, or modified billboards.**

8.4240 Billboards. The following criteria shall be applicable for all the billboards allowed in the City of Redmond under Section 8.4245.

1. No billboard shall be erected within 500 feet of another billboard on the same side of the roadway. The distance between billboards shall be measured along the centerline of the road.
2. No billboards shall exceed a maximum height of thirty feet.
3. The face size of any billboard shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in vertical height or twenty-four (24) feet in horizontal dimension.
4. Billboards may be installed on public or private property, subject to the consent of the property owner, and city approval based on the City's evaluation of traffic safety issues resulting from the billboard. No billboard shall be installed within any transportation right of-way.
5. All structural supports for billboards shall be constructed of steel.
6. Evidence must be provided showing the obtaining of a state permit from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) in compliance with the Oregon Motorists Information Act of 1971, where applicable.
7. The applicant shall acquire a conditional use permit (CUP) from the City of Redmond for each individual billboard prior to installing or relocating any billboard subject to the criteria in Section 8.0600.
- ~~8. Tri-Vision Billboards: Dwell time between changing messages on a Tri-vision style billboard face is no more frequent than every eight (8) seconds, and the actual rotation process is accomplished in four (4) seconds or less. It can display no more than three separate and distinct messages in any direction.~~
- 8.-9. Lighting of Billboards: No sign shall be so illuminated that it interferes with the effectiveness of any official traffic device or that it impairs the vision of a driver of any motor vehicle or that otherwise interferes with a driver's operation of a motor vehicle. No sign shall be so illuminated that it causes glare to adjacent residential structures. All lighting of billboards shall be shielded downcast lighting. Any approved lighting of billboards shall be from solar systems or underground electrical lines; overhead electrical lines are prohibited.**

Other Sign Code refinements and minor changes

8.4070 Permit Exceptions.

The following signs or procedures shall not require a sign permit. Provided, however, these signs shall be subject to the provisions of Section 8.4110 excepting subsection (10).

1. Exempt signs listed in Section 8.4100.
2. The changing of advertising or message on an approved painted or printed sign or sign specifically designed for the use of replaceable copy, ~~except for changing the name of the business or use advertised.~~
3. The painting, repainting, cleaning, and normal maintenance, and repair of an existing sign unless a substantial structural change is made.
4. Daily display signs and banners erected during street closures associated with construction. This exemption is only for the duration of the street closure.

Staff Note: If the sign itself is already approved, it should be fine to switch out for different tenants. Otherwise, Staff is just reviewing "content" of the sign, which is prohibited by law.

8.4180 Signs Permitted in the Downtown Overlay District.

This section shall apply to all signs in the Downtown Overlay District. No signs shall be permitted in this Overlay District except as provided in this section.

3. Ground Mounted or Monument Sign
- A. Shall not exceed 20 square feet in area and not more than 5 feet high. A base not to exceed 2 feet in height is allowed. Sign calculation is only based on the sign area.
 - B. Not within 10 feet of any other sign
 - ~~C. Must have a setback of 5 feet from right of way (sidewalk)~~
 - D. Outside of the clear vision area
 - E. No more than one monument/ground mounted sign per street frontage
 - F. One illuminated or cabinet sign is allowed subject to the following standards:
 - i. Shall include a dark background. White or light colored backgrounds are prohibited.
 - ii. Complies with Section 8.4080 Material standards.
 - iii. Only one ground mounted illuminated cabinet sign is allowed on a property.

Staff Note: No reason for a sign setback in the Downtown Overlay. Mandatory clear vision areas are already regulated.

Recommendation/Course of Action:

The Planning Commission will need to review and discuss the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments presented. No formal recommendation or course of action is necessary at this time. Once the work session discussion is complete, the public hearing draft will be presented at an upcoming Planning Commission hearing.