



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
541-923-7724

www.redmondoregon.gov

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

411 SW 9th Street-COUNCIL CHAMBERS Redmond, OR 97756 or

Monday, November 14, 2022 6:30 pm

Oral comments can be provided in-person or virtually. For those who plan to provide oral comments virtually during the hearing, pre-register at planredmond@redmondoregon.gov (must pre-register before 4:00 p.m. on November 14th)

Stream the meeting live at: <https://www.redmondoregon.gov/government/city-council/council-meeting-info/meeting-agendas-minutes-and-video>

Agenda

UAPC Members	
Teri Jansen, Chair	I. CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS
Ron Osmundson, Vice-Chair	II. CITIZEN COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Heather DeWolf	III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES a. October 3, 2022 b. October 17, 2022
Norman Schultz	IV. REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE (WORK SESSION) a. RDC Amendments: Timeline & Adoption Schedule b. Multi-family Complex Building Window Alignment c. Multi-family Complex Off-street Parking Requirements d. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) e. Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Modification f. Off-street Parking Requirement for Plexes g. Landscaping Standards for Single-family Detached Dwellings, Plexes, and Townhouses
Richard Bryant	V. NOVEMBER 21 st DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION
Joseph Zampko	VI. NEXT ROUND OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – JANUARY 2023
Vacancy	VII. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS
Ex-Officio Vacancy	VIII. ADJOURN
	Please note that these documents are also available on the City's website www.redmondoregon.gov; 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 Kelly.morse@redmondoregon.gov The City of Redmond encourages all citizens to participate in its programs and activities. This meeting location is accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for accommodation may include sign language interpreter service, assistive listening devices, materials in an alternate format or any other accommodation. If any accommodations are needed, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 541-504-3036 or access@redmondoregon.gov. Requests should be made as soon as possible, but at least 3 business days prior to the scheduled meeting. 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

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756-2213

Phone **541-923-7724**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.redmondoregon.gov

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers
MINUTES Worksheet
October 3, 2022

Commissioners Present: Chair Teri Jansen, Vice-Chair Ron Osmundson, Richard "Dick" Bryant, Joseph Zampko, *Heather DeWolf, Norman Schultz, 1 vacancy*

Youth Ex Officio: Vacant

City Staff: Kyle Roberts, *Planning Director*; John Roberts, *Deputy City Manager*; Chuck Arnold, *Urban Renewal Program Manager*; Linda Cline, *Housing Program Analyst*; Megan Jacob, *Associate Planner*; Sarah Vowell, *Assistant Planner*; Jamie Christofferson, *Planning Permit Coordinator*.

Visitors: Krisanna Clark-Endicott, *Council Liaison*, Wanda Wai Lyian Toe

Media: None

(The 3 digits after a motion title show the number of commissioners voting in favor/opposed/abstaining.)

I. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Jansen called the work session of the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m., October 3, 2022, with a quorum present (4 of 6 commissioners). Commissioner Schultz was excused.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

Planning Director Kyle Roberts reminded the commission there are a few terms set to expire on December 31st: Teri Jansen, Richard Bryant, and Heather DeWolf. If they are interested in serving again, they can let the City Recorder or Mr. Roberts know. He noted the terms are for four years.

III. REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE (WORK SESSION)

A. Anticipated Timeline & Adoption Schedule

Deputy City Manager John Roberts discussed the most up-to-date timeline of the evolving adoption schedule of the Redmond Development Code Amendments (included in the packet) which included five work sessions with this commission, three work sessions with the City Council, and two public hearings.

B. Proposed Amendments: Topics, Timelines, and Leads

Mr. John Roberts outlined the agenda for the rest of the meeting.

C. Fee Schedule -- Establish In-Lieu of Parking Fee

Urban Renewal Program Manager Chuck Arnold presented these items because these are two issues specific to the Urban Renewal program or properties within the Urban Renewal boundary (map included in packet).

Mr. Arnold discussed establishing changes to the development code for an in-lieu of parking fee schedule. It is already written in the code that there shall be a fee schedule established from time to time. The Urban Renewal team worked with Planning to determine the value of on-street parking facilities and has set a fee-in-lieu of rate generally pretty close to what is seen in other markets, about 75 percent of the developer cost.

The goal is to connect the Downtown pedestrian-oriented development, creating scale and interaction, and maximizing the area's densities and opportunities where possible when new development comes along, which having a fee schedule and an active in-lieu-of helps to do. It also plans for future impacts on parking. An in-lieu-of fee pays into the fund. The figure they arrived at is \$7300 per parking space. He explained how the program would work.

He addressed questions from the commission as follows:

- The program only applies to new development. He understood that the Planning Division would look at an established building that is zero lot line and say they cannot reasonably provide more parking on-site based on the envelope of the building and as such are not required to. Mr. John Roberts added the program is a tool, not a mandatory one, that could be leveraged to see some creative development to fruition to help the vibrancy of Downtown.
- The program funds would go into creating more than likely parking facilities in close proximity to where the development is which is typically the goal of a parking in-lieu-of fee. Sometimes geography and other things make the execution impossible, but the intent is to create a resource close to where it is needed. It would be public parking.
- The management of parking lots like at Centennial Park and at 4th and Evergreen and the fees are a separate item from the in-lieu-of program and has no impact. Mr. John Roberts gave an example of a company wanting to come in and do a big expansion but did not have parking available. The City could tell them it is developing a parking lot on 4th and Evergreen, and the company would help offset the costs.

[Proceeded to Item E]

D. Definitions/Deed Restrictions for Affordable & Workforce Housing

Mr. John Roberts prefaced the item by stating the definitions are fresh, having just been inserted in the code. The city is looking to modernize the definitions to make them more realistic and usable. Housing Program Analyst Linda Cline discussed how Staff did a lot of research on what others are doing with the definitions and attempted to keep them consistent with Redmond's neighbors to the south. The definitions are consistent with what partners here in town like Habitat for Humanity are doing in their home ownership housing and also Housing Works with Midtown Place.

With affordability, nobody should be spending more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing. With regard to rent for low-income or affordable housing, people that are making 60 percent less than the area median income (AMI) should not be spending more than 30 percent of their gross pay. For buying a home that is affordable housing, someone making 80 percent or less of the area median income should not spend over 30 percent of their gross income.

A deed restriction component was added to the definitions. If a developer is getting incentives or the city is doing an annexing for them and they are asked to include affordable housing, the city does not want them to sell it and five years later it be bought and then in another five years it be flipped at market rate. The proposal is for a 30-year deed restriction which is in step with some of the state programs. She shared the feedback sought on the deed restriction from the Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC). Ultimately their thoughts where as more incentives are built in or as modifications, variances, or exceptions are allowed, the City could ask for a longer deed restriction.

Staff wanted to beef up the workforce housing description and be more specific. People earning from 80 to 120 percent of the area median income should not spend more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing. Staff also wanted a deed restriction with workforce housing with the more incentives a developer gets, longer deed restrictions can be added, but 30 years is a good basic place to start. This was also put before HCDC. In some exceptions regarding the Downtown Overlay District, Staff made sure the definitions were clear throughout the code.

Mr. John Roberts noted the handout the City of Bend produced was included in the packet which helps visualize what types of organizations target what AMI levels in terms of the product they build. One of the documents handed out at this meeting showed for a family of four, the AMI is 100 percent at \$89,900. A single-family home priced to be affordable in that range would be \$358,000. The average price of a single-family home in Redmond is now \$550,000. He thought sideboards with the definitions will help in conversations with production builders moving forward.

Staff addressed questions from the commission:

- With grants and similar over the 30-year timeframe, are those required to be paid back by the homeowner? There are many different affordable housing programs. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, for example, is not a payback program but a credit that goes to the developer. Another example is if you build an affordable unit, it receives some type of subsidy. Deed restriction usually caps appreciation of the unit at 3 percent. It could also go lower. If the family sells it after 25 years, they will still have equity. The Community Block Grant can do grant programs and loan programs, but what it will probably do going forward is help with land acquisition for Habitat, for example. It will be good to be consistent in that program with all the other programs in the city by having a set definition in the code
- According to the Beacon Report, a single-family home bought in Redmond three years ago has appreciated \$47,000 per year.

[Proceeded to Item F]

E. Downtown Overlay District Boundary Expansion

Mr. Arnold discussed how the goals of the Downtown Design Overlay District and the purpose items within the definition are a lot of the same tenets in the Urban Renewal Plan and work in concert. Different standards apply in the Downtown Overlay trying to encourage a diverse set of uses and development. Everything outside of heavy industrial is pretty much welcomed and encouraged in the zone. He described the Downtown Overlay District boundaries (map in the packet). Staff worked with Planning with an economic development lens to look at a potential boundary expansion. If expanded, the standards would be applicable for those tax lots.

The long view is how does the city want the Downtown core to grow and the center of the community which is kind of boxed in by Highway 26 to the south as far as what is trying to be created for pedestrian scale. What would make the most sense is to try to encourage the scale and walkability to the north. This expansion would set the table for doing so. Staff found no noticeable negative impacts or unintended consequences. They recommend moving forward with the idea.

Mr. John Roberts explained the proposed expansion via maps of the Urban Renewal District and the Downtown Overlay District. Engineering came to Planning with exploring the idea, and he explained Engineering's perspective. An expansion does not guarantee anything but could open up creative development in Redmond.

Staff addressed questions from the commission:

- After initially thinking of expanding the area to Canal, it was changed in an attempt to be respectful to the character of the neighborhood and how it evolves. There is a lot of

commercial happening east of 4th. To Staff, the area is more of a buffer zone than a Downtown design. The Downtown Overlay District boundary expansion will also create opportunities for two different grant fund resources through Urban Renewal which are not accessible as of now, the Restaurant Capital Assistance Fund and a Facade Grant both of which he detailed.

- The Public Works policy on calculating SDCs is included in the packet.
- Urban Renewal has a Downtown Plan, a Midtown Plan, and a Medical District Plan, each of which looks at the existing and future development of the areas. The goal of Midtown is to provide a bit of transition between Downtown and the Medical District. At this time and for at least the next 10 years, it makes sense to have it only go this far and not all the way to Jackpine. Mr. Arnold discussed an example of how Midtown Place would feel a little out of place were it included in the Downtown Overlay.

[Proceeded to Item D]

F. Attached Garage Setbacks in Residential Zones

Associate Planner Megan Jacob and Assistant Planner Sarah Vowell talked about garage setbacks and a change to the code which would make it more uniform and easier to read and brings into alignment detached and attached rear setbacks for garages. They proposed to change the vehicular access to garages to 20 feet to match the standards for driveways and allowing for a minimum of one car to park outside the garage. Also, for people who do not have automatic garage door openers, it allows them to get out of the right-of-way to open their garage. She shared a graphic of how a car might approach a garage with a five-foot setback versus what current detached garages are at 20 feet and then the proposed change to attached garages. Detached garages are already set at 20 feet.

Staff received a comment letter from Central Oregon Builders Association (COBA) requesting to change the rear setback to 10 feet for alley-loaded garages. Staff really wants to maintain consistency so there are no conflicts in code. Mr. Kyle Roberts thought COBA was speaking specifically to infill development. Work sessions are great because nothing is set in stone at this meeting. The discussions can be revisited, especially with a standard such as rear setback to the alley for garages with townhouses being set at zero feet which was based on the model code.

Staff addressed questions from the commission:

- If there were two dedicated parking spots, where would the parking go? Was that also the purpose behind the 20 feet? Staff proposes 20 feet because the detached accessory structures that act for garages is also 20 for the vehicular entrance as well as the driveway standard for new single-family dwellings. It has to have a 9x20 space which can be accommodated with a five-foot setback off of an alley.
- Under HB-2001, more than one parking spot cannot be required per unit which applies only to apartments, not single-family housing.
- Alleys are typically 20 feet wide.

G. Accessory Dwelling Unit Setbacks

Associate Planner Megan Jacob and Assistant Planner Sarah Vowell addressed a proposed correction to the references in the code for accessory dwelling unit (ADU) setbacks. Currently Table 8.04140 refers the reader to Code Section 8.0325 for the definition of ADU setbacks. The definition was unintentionally omitted. This amendment corrects the omission by adding a table to 8.0325 to define the setbacks, specifically the rear setbacks. The front and side setbacks follow the underlying zone. Allowances have been made for rear setbacks in one-stories and two-stories abutting an alley and not abutting an alley. Staff also feels it will provide some inclusion and allow some lots the ability to build an ADU where one may not be able to with the underlying zone with a rear setback of 20 feet.

The graphics she shared were not included in the packet but handed out to the commissioners.

Mr. John Roberts said this subject might seem simple on the surface, but having a setback for ADU is a rather pithy discussion because there are a lot of variables to consider with different directions a development could take. Oftentimes one size does not fit all. Staff gets a lot more inquiries on ADUs than are actually built and permitted which Staff believed through their research is not necessarily because of Redmond's standards but more because of the SDCs associated with building them and the increased cost to build them.

Staff developed language to try to recognize the ability to deviate from the standards once they are in place to allow people to propose a deviation. It would be an administrative review, not necessarily a formal variance process. It would require some acknowledgement from the neighbor.

IV. Next Meeting October 17, 2022

- October 17, 2022, 6:30 p.m. (3rd Monday) – in-person

V. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Jansen strongly encouraged every commissioner to attend the City Council work session the commission was invited to, on October 11th. She requested every commissioner attend not only to represent the community but also to be available to Council to hear from the entire commission if they so choose.

Vice-Chair Osmundson noted the youth aficionado is vacant from this commission. If anyone knows of someone who would like to apply, that would be great. The commission likes to have young voices and get their input on how Redmond is developing.

VI. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Jansen adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2022.

ATTEST:

_____/s/
Teri Jansen
Chair

_____/s/
Kyle Roberts
Planning Director



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756-2213

Phone **541-923-7724**
Fax 541-548-0706

www.redmondoregon.gov

REDMOND URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers

MINUTES

October 17, 2022

Commissioners Present: Chair Teri Jansen, Vice-Chair Ron Osmundson, Richard "Dick" Bryant, Heather DeWolf, Norman Schultz, Joseph Zampko, **1 vacancy**

Youth Ex Officio: **Vacant**

City Staff: Kyle Roberts, *Planning Director*; John Roberts, *Deputy City Manager*; Jamie Christofferson, *Planning Permit Coordinator*

Visitors: Steve Curley, *Executive Director of Redmond Economic Development, Inc.*, Morgan Greenwood, *Vice President of Government Affairs with COBA*

Media: None

(The 3 digits after a motion title show the number of commissioners voting in favor/opposed/abstaining.)

I. CALL TO ORDER – INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Jansen called the work session of the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m., October 17, 2022, with a quorum present (5 of 6 commissioners). Commissioner Schultz was excused and trying to join virtually. He can submit questions or comments via chat.

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. September 12, 2022

B. September 19, 2022

Commissioner Osmundson moved to approve the September 12, 2022, minutes and September 19, 2002, minutes as presented, seconded by Commissioner Bryant. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE (WORK SESSION)

A. Large Lot Industrial (LLI) Zone

Deputy City Manager John Roberts presented the map of the South Redmond Tract or Large Lot Industrial Area. Before the Commission are some suggested changes.

Steve Curley, Executive Director of Redmond Economic Development, Inc. (REDI), discussed the South Redmond Tract industrial parcel including some historical background and reported the first business is under contract with the first 200 acres of the property. As this is the very first user, REDI and City Staff are reviewing the large lot industrial code.

The clarifications are minor overall. The intent is to clarify and update the code so that it is generally more practical to move forward.

Mr. Roberts said what they are looking at is well over a decade's worth of collaboration and work. The guidance is really predicated on the OARs (included in the packet) which he and Mr. Curley had read probably no less than two dozen times. The amendments are timely in that the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council requires a 10-year renewal. He discussed the concept site plan of the large lot industrial area, and Mr. Curley provided more background on the area.

They addressed questions from the Commission as follows:

- Clarified the subject area was not part of land-swapping with the County.
- Clarified the OMD facility is not part of what is under discussion but is the Oregon Military Department, the National Guard armory which will not be moved into the South Redmond Tract but is just north of it.
- Road expansions east to west within this tract will probably not include a road on the east side connecting north and south. It will likely remain the sort of east side boundary for quite some time to come because further east gets into some more airport runway overlays.
- Believed the property to the east and to the south of the tract is BLM. As one goes farther south, it is a lot of state BLM land there.
- Confirmed the 200-acre site could not be further subdivided after being bought by a single owner or buyer but must be developed into a 200-acre site of some type which is one of the tenets of large lot industrial, keeping the property large lot for a single large user such as Facebook or a big manufacturer.
- The 50-acre sites also must go to one developer. However, there is a stipulation in the code if the site has been in the large lot industrial program for 10 years, if it is not developed, it would be allowable within the OARs to rezone to smaller parcels. As they read it, the 10 years started in 2019.
- Examples of commercial that would go in the conceptual service commercial sites of the tract include, as referenced in the code, service commercial that supports the primary traded sector use. They believed it could be food and confirmed it could be research, something big, not something small, not like a restaurant. It is not for what one would generally think of as commercial.
- Confirmed there are 200 acres under contract, currently in the due diligence period. They were not permitted to say who it is.
- As far as commercial/industrial out around the airport and all the area out east, Redmond is currently at less than 1 percent vacancy rate; virtually no buildings are available. One is just coming online by Neighbor Impact, flex space up to 2400 square feet down to 2000. There is another smaller flex space unit over by Badger being built. The land is also getting absorbed. Redmond continues strong with a lot of activity and interest in the area, despite the economic outlook of other areas.
- There is land in contract and in planning that would add around 150 acres of light and heavy industrial and C-4 commercial, confirming there is land to the east and potential there. If the land swap is realized, it would add another 156 acres or so. There is potential, but it is getting used up on the supply side pretty quickly.
- Confirmed the intent of the large lot industrial land is to bring jobs to the area, acknowledging data centers do not bring a lot of jobs. REDI filters through that. Economic Development and REDI have been focused on living wage manufacturing jobs which is where they have put their effort.
- Confirmed any issues with the FAA for flights coming in and out of Redmond were vetted in the design of the lot. The flight paths are more diagonal to the lot. The airport director had no concerns, even if larger buildings go in with larger roofs. Apparently, that would not be an issue. Reflections from roofs is typically not a concern, although the question of solar panels had not been discussed specifically.
- The FAA controls where the old golf course is. REDI had a site visit with an aviation-related

company and looked at that specific property. There is planned road realignment out there which will open up the property to direct access to the airport. Those will be properties that can get manufacturing and industrial-type projects to develop.

14:45 Commissioner Schultz joined the meeting virtually at this time

B. Neighborhood Meeting Requirements

Mr. Roberts discussed modifications and expansion of the neighborhood meeting requirements. A common tool a lot of communities deploy is, as part of larger applications, putting the onus of the initial neighborhood outreach on the applicant or developer themselves. This item speaks to broadening such a requirement. Neighborhood provisions are already in the code for cell towers and were inserted in June for master development plans. Staff recommends the provisions be applied to other development applications, primarily ones that trigger over 200 vehicle trips. The other three application types would be master development plans, planned unit developments (PUDs), and wireless and broadcast communication facilities.

He addressed questions from the Commission as follows:

- Regarding whether this requirement would open the door for more complaining about particular types of development people may not want in their backyard, one cannot predict how a meeting will go. NIMBYism is always going to exist. The neighborhood meeting creates a venue for reasonable conversations.
- No matter what is done with notice for neighbors to be involved in such a meeting, it is never enough, but currently in the code the requirements are 250 feet or 100 feet, depending on the type of application. For cell towers, the requirement is 1000 feet. Statewide for any county land use applications with resource lands, EFU, or forest, the largest radius is 1000 feet. Staff suggests 250 feet inside city limits and 750 outside city limits which would be affidavit of mailed notices. It would also be required to post the properties. Staff is fairly confident word would spread fast. Staff looked at six to eight other jurisdictions, and the suggested notice radiuses are in line with them.
- Confirmed the intent of the meeting is to bring neighbors and the developer together. Planning staff's and the Planning Commission's involvement will be at the actual public hearing stage.
- Regarding whether there would be a chance to have a second neighborhood meeting, what is written into the proposed amendment is if the application is significantly modified, a second neighborhood meeting must be conducted. If it gets through the approval process and the developer is already pulling building permits, there would not necessarily be any requirement to have a neighborhood meeting. This question was asked due to the reaction to the cottages on Helmholtz where the nearby residents said there was no neighborhood meeting, and they never knew about one. A meeting could have offset a lot of the anger and issues during that time.

Comments from the Commissioners included:

- The proposed changes give a great opportunity for the neighborhood and gives the developer time to adjust things. The neighbors can provide input on what they want the neighborhood to look like.
- The goal would be hopefully to smooth out the process so maybe there would not be a big appeal or a big hearing process trying to get a development done which ultimately saves money all the way around, too.
- Traditionally speaking, the neighborhood meetings are pretty successful for both community members and developers. Not everybody will ever agree on how it ultimately looks, but it does open up the communication which is mostly what people like. They want to know they are not being left out of the conversation. Since no decisions are made at the neighborhood meetings, there is no tension.
- At least somebody from the Planning staff should be involved in the meeting to explain to the

property owners what is allowable in whatever particular zone they are developing in so that it is perfectly clear to the homeowners that what is being proposed is compatible. Staff said they discussed if Staff should attend, but the meeting should not be perceived as being conducted by the city. There is a requirement to notify City Staff as well as the neighbors, and it is structured in that the developer is taking the feedback from the pre-development meeting and carrying it forward.

- It would be a more honest meeting if it just the developer and the citizens. If City Staff were present, citizens may feel they are not being heard or the meeting is being influenced by Staff.

Chair Jansen thanked Commissioners Osmundson and Bryant for joining her at the City Council work session last week and getting to hear Council's feedback on the proposed amendments. It was good for all of them to be there and nice to be acknowledged they were there and a part of the process which is important since the Commissioners do represent the citizens of Redmond.

C. R-3 - R-5 Minimum Lot Sizes

Planning Director Kyle Roberts discussed minimum lot sizes in R-3 through R-5 zoning districts. One of the City's key stakeholders, the Central Oregon Builders Association (COBA) was involved throughout the process of Staff's reevaluating specification standards for residential zoning districts. COBA brought up reducing the minimum lot sizes in R-3, R-4, and R-5. When the huge package of amendments was taken to City Council in the spring, it was decided minimum lot sizes would remain as they are. Council directed Staff to revisit the minimum lot sizes for these zoning districts. When Staff first reevaluated the densities, they recognized the minimum densities in R-4 and R-5 were very high which caused applicants to have nearly an impossible time developing subdivisions to meet the minimum density thresholds, prompting Staff to review the policies recommended in the Comprehensive Plan.

For R-4 and R-5 the 10 and 15 minimum units per acre were higher than what the Comp Plan recommended. At that time Staff brought the numbers to what in June they were ultimately adopted as, down to 5 in R-5 and 8 in R-5.

He discussed what COBA has proposed for R-3 and R-4. The Comp Plan does say it is possible to evaluate reducing the minimum lot sizes and Staff is open to that. However, Staff did not support reducing the minimum lot size any lower in R-5 because that does not agree with what the Comp Plan has recommended. Housing needs analysis would not support it either which he explained.

Chair Jansen stated especially on R-5, there is the ability to go up and meet the numbers. Basically, City Council reiterated at their last work session that they wanted no changes to densities or setbacks.

Mr. Kyle Roberts clarified Redmond does not have a floor area ratio in its development code. Maximum lot coverage can be used because there are various ways to account for the bulk in size on lots.

Morgan Greenwood, Vice President of Government Affairs with COBA, walked through the exhibits attached to the letter she emailed to the Commission this afternoon. COBA's reduced lot size numbers did come from the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The reduced lot size for R-5 is not noted in either the housing needs analysis or in the Comp Plan. However, it does allow for a single-family product on an independent lot, similar to what code allows for cottage clusters. It provides a similar lifestyle for folks who are downsizing, young families starting out, single-parent families with the added protections and privacy of an independent lot underlying.

She shared images of and discussed existing examples of minimum lots sizes that are currently

developed in Redmond.

Chair Jansen noted the first exhibit was a mixed housing developments and is used as an example of such within a subdivision. She explained mixed housing as design development with single-family homes on the bigger lots and then apartments and townhomes, allowing for more density within the development while using design factors that make it an attractive development and subdivision. It all sort of flows.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed the side yard setback on the two double-stories in the second exhibit is a total of 10 feet, five feet from the property line to the dwelling which are also the same dimensions on the single-stories. She believed the single-story houses are a little over 1200 square feet and the two-story a little over 1500 square feet. She acknowledged the entire frontage of Prairie Crossing was cut approximately in half on the south side but noted these different lots are all the same underlying zone.

The third exhibit illustrated what else is allowable in all five of Redmond's residential zones but R-3 through R-5 in particular, using Parkland Townhomes.

R-5 is intended to be Redmond's highest density residential zone with multi-family, townhomes, and some discrete single-family dwelling options. However, the townhomes in the exhibit are permitted as a result of House Bill 2001 in all of the city's residential zones. In order to provide the 60 percent single-family needed housing type, providing the opportunity to do additional single-family in R-5 also offsets the allowable development of townhomes in all residential zones.

She discussed Prairie Crossing as a planned unit development and why her members would not just apply for a PUD whenever they want to develop lots of such scale, which include consistency of development going forward, the added time and expense of a Planning Commission hearing, and no guarantee by reading the development code that such a housing type would be permissible. Most of Southwest Redmond is currently zoned R-2, and the way it has developed so far, it is almost exclusively PUDs. There are very few examples of a 9000 square-foot lot in R-2.

There is very little R-1 and R-2 available to be developed. The plurality of developable zones in Redmond is R-4. Adding available land in R-5 brings it to about 60 percent of the developable lands in Redmond. Taking that into account and the cost of land right now, it helps to shave a significant percentage of the development cost and allows the product to be delivered at a much more affordable rate to a Redmond resident of median income.

She acknowledged the approximate cost and time of a PUD process versus a subdivision depends on the case. The time for moving through both the notification process and the Planning Commission process fluctuates significantly. She thought Prairie Crossing, for example, took two years before they were finalized. Mr. John Roberts stated the PUD was envisioned to be an alternate path from the Master Plan. But the Master Plan process and PUD take about the same amount of time and ultimately the cost is very close with the PUD being a little less than the Master Plan.

Chair Jansen stated everyone present is invited to attend the next City Council work session on November 1st, and it does make a difference when the Commission has a presence at such meetings.

Commissioner DeWolf apologized to City Council for not making the last work session since she had out-of-town commitments. She will make it a point to reach out which she has already attempted. She thought City Council's intent was to try and keep Redmond as close to Redmond

as they can. She also thought it is important to stress the history of the R-5 and R-4 designated lands: when it occurred, when House Bill 2001 came into play, and what that allows in all of the city's residential zones, not just the high-densities.

Multi-family is now allowed in almost every zone Redmond has: commercial, industrial, all residential. There will be more multi-family due to the high cost of land and the high cost of development. More units need to be created in order to be able to afford to do the development. She thinks it is important to preserve single-family housing and to do so, Redmond needs to do the opposite of what it thinks it needs to do. The way to handle more multi-family in all zones is to reduce the minimum lot size so the savings cost to the developer can be passed along to the end user. Nobody wants to see tiny lots everywhere, but it is happening because of the situation.

For instance, with a 7500 minimum lot size in R-3, if a seller catches wind that apartments could go there with ground-floor commercial or multi-living, their property is appraised higher and becomes more valuable for the more units that can go in. In order for those to still pencil for single-family homes, they need to have flexibility as it relates to maintaining the value. There is still some confusion to her mind with multiplexes and the minimum lot size on those because part of House Bill 2000 and 458 says a detached plex can be allowed which is what this is doing. Single-family houses on smaller lots can still have the same unit count as townhomes and remove the wall. When products are attached, it raises the HOA fees which are passed on to the buyer and tenant with higher liability all the way around.

When the City goes back to the Buildable Land Inventory and set the zonings, that we foresaw House Bill 2001. It needs to be considered how to maintain some detached products still.

Chair Jansen said an example given of a detached plex is fourplexes on a single lot, with SB-458. Commissioner DeWolf added it is encouraged so there can be individual ownership. But right now how it is written, one is not allowed to sell the unit. There would not be an individual lot. Mr. John Roberts acknowledged the provisions are tricky and are the reason they have never really been used. The code allows the ability to build a detached quadplex which would likely be on one tax lot instead of an individual lot. He clarified it does create home ownership and that is the intent. The trick is how the common area is managed and shared.

Mr. Kyle Roberts confirmed by default a detached quadplex in Redmond's code is all on one legal lot of record which means one ownership for all four of the units. Now with Senate Bill 458 one can do middle housing land division where the lot could be split into four separate tax lots and create home ownership for each one of the detached units. The provision is so new that it has not been done yet and as such he could not confirm whether the splitting into separate lots comes after the product is built or simultaneous with the subdivision, adding one can come in after the fact. Mr. John Roberts noted the most difficult part as Staff is what is the easiest way to meter these with utilities, shared or individual meters, adding it is in the City's interest to have shared meters.

V. Next Meeting November 7, 2022

- November 7, 2022, 6:30 p.m. (1st Monday) – in-person

VI. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. John Roberts reported some of the main points of feedback brought up at the last development code amendments work session with City Council. About two-thirds of the points will require additional research on Staff's end and additional changes to the code:

- A request for more diagrams, visuals, and photos to help people actually see what, for example, a 4000 versus a 6500 square-foot lot means and the type of product one could have.
- Some apprehension on how useful the M-1.5 zone could be, but to take the merits of it and try

to share equally among light industrial and heavy industrial and allow the zone district to maybe be applied to both situations through a conditional use permit. He clarified the M-1.5 zone was not brought about by state legislation.

- Good discussion on affordable housing and wanting to see some examples of how a true affordable housing project is financed and structured. What does bringing in subsidies do to development costs or mortgages and to see that in terms of a project targeted at 60 percent versus a project that is entirely private.
- Discussions on ADU rear setbacks such as two-story ADUs as proposed. Projects can be pushed out to the front of properties to provide for bigger backyards. Staff should provide Council with more examples on ADUs.
- Some questions about PUDs and 100 percent max density, what it looks like.
- Questions such as are garages required for cottages, does the city allow pocket parks to be 50 percent turf, should Redmond even require pocket parks in light of the drought.
- With the suggestion to define an RV park as two or more RVs, what might the implications be for the safe parking program?
- Consider some tradeoffs with parking in-lieu if it can be used as an incentive in developments or reduced parking could help with affordable or workforce housing projects.

Staff is ambitious, wanting in 2023 to start another round of amendments. The three top issues would include Redmond has two types of cottage developments. Staff wants to align them so there is one cottage standard at which time parking and things like garages will be clearly articulated. Also Track 1 and Track 2 processes for permitting need polishing. There is also the opportunity to better look at the Master Plan communities. The three issues will be worked on as they relate to House Bill 2001.

Mr. Kyle Roberts thought at this time cottages do not require garages. Mr. John Roberts added the cottages built do not have garages. Obviously shared parking is evaluated.

VII. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Jansen adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

APPROVED by the Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission and SIGNED by me this _____ day of _____, 2022.

ATTEST:

_____/s/
Teri Jansen
Chair

_____/s/
Kyle Roberts
Planning Director

Attachment 1:

Redmond Development Code (RDC) Amendments: Timeline & Adoption Schedule				
Meetings (2022)	September	October	November	December
Planning Commission Work Session	12-Sep			
Planning Commission Work Session	19-Sep			
Planning Commission Work Session		3-Oct		
City Council Work Session *		11-Oct		
Planning Commission Work Session		17-Oct		
Planning Commission Work Session			14-Nov	
City Council Work Session *			15-Nov	
Planning Commission Public Hearing			21-Nov (Decision Point)	
City Council - Public Hearing *				13-Dec (Decision Point)

Opportunity for Individual Meetings (2 conducted)

5 Planning Commission Work Sessions; 2 Council Work Sessions

*** Planning Commission Invited to Attend All Council Meetings**



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session
HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
REVIEWING STAFF: Kyle Roberts, Planning Director
TOPIC: Multi-family Complex Building Window Alignment

I. Purpose

The purpose of the subject proposed amendment is to add a reasonable exception to an existing standard to encourage good building design.

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and in Red or Red Underline.

Amendment:

ARTICLE IV – SITE AND DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS - INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

(***)

8.3035 Design Review Criteria. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following applicable criteria shall be met.

(***)

4. Architectural Requirements.

(***)

- E. Multi-Family Complexes.** This section establishes a process for the review of multi-family complexes development proposals in order to promote functional, safe, innovative, and attractive development that is compatible with the natural and man-made environment. The intent is to promote compatible development, foster the attractiveness and functional utility of multi-family development, protect public and private investments in the area, raise the level of community expectations for the quality of its environment.

(***)

6. **Building Alignment.** There shall be no window to adjoining window alignment when adjacent buildings are less than 30 feet apart. Frosted windows or similar are exempt from this standard.

(***)

//Analysis: The adjoining window alignment standard only applies to the design of multi-family complexes; a building or group of buildings on a single lot containing five or more dwelling units. The standard is intended to prevent the placement of adjoining windows when buildings are less than 30 feet apart to ensure privacy for adjacent dwelling units.

Staff has found that applicants are removing windows from building elevation plans in order to meet this standard. This is an undesired, unintended consequence. Because typically the windows proposed to be removed are bathroom windows, staff is recommending adding an exception to the standard that allows frosted windows, or similar, to be allowed. This will discourage the removal of adjoining windows and ensure privacy.//



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session

HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission

REVIEWING STAFF: John Roberts, Deputy City Manager
Linda Cline, Housing Program Analyst

TOPIC: Definitions / Multi-family Complex Off-Street Parking Requirements

I. Purpose

- Update definitions related to dwelling types.
- Revise off-street parking requirements to better align with dwelling type and capacity.
- Reduce barriers to achieve public goals and great buy-in.

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and in Red.

8.0020 Definitions

(***)

Dwelling. As follows:

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADUs). A secondary living unit, attached or detached, accessory to a single-family detached dwelling in a residential zone containing cooking facilities meeting the dimensional standards and other requirements of the zone district in which it is located.

Duplex. Two attached, or detached, dwelling units on a Lot or Parcel when neither is an accessory dwelling.

► **Dwelling Unit (DU).** A single unit providing complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.

Guest House. A detached building used as sleeping quarters for guests of the occupants of the main dwelling and having no cooking facilities.

Live/work Dwelling. A building type that consists of commercial space on the ground floor and residential space on the ground and/or upper floors. The ground floor commercial or office space has visibility, signage, and access from the primary street. To preserve the pedestrian orientation of the commercial or office space, alley or rear access is required to provide services and residential parking. A separate home occupation may be allowed in addition to the commercial space. The permitted live/work dwelling types are defined below:

- A. Live/work Townhouse: A townhouse in which a business shall be limited to the ground floor and may not exceed 50% of the floor area of the entire townhouse unit, excluding the garage.
- B. Live/Work Apartment: A residential multi-story, multi-unit building with a minimum of 50% of the building ground floor used as retail, office, or commercial space. Residential units may be rented or for sale (condominium or cooperative) units.

Manufactured Dwelling. Manufactured Dwellings. Means:

Residential trailer. A structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy, that is being used for residential purposes and that was constructed before January 1, 1962.

Mobile Home. A structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy, that is being used for residential purposes and that was constructed between January 1, 1962, and June 15, 1976, and met the construction requirements of Oregon mobile home law in effect at the time of construction.

Manufactured Home. A structure constructed for movement on the public highways that has sleeping, cooking and plumbing facilities, that is intended for human occupancy, that is being used for residential purposes and that was constructed in accordance with federal manufactured housing construction and safety standards and regulations in effect at the time of construction.

Manufactured dwelling does not include any building or structure constructed to conform to the State of Oregon Structural Specialty Code or the Low-Rise Residential Dwelling Code or any unit identified as a recreational vehicle by the manufacturer.

Multi-Family Complex. A building or group of buildings on a single lot containing a total of five or more dwelling units.

Quadplex. Four attached, or detached, dwelling units on a Lot or Parcel.

Single Family Detached Dwelling. ~~Single Family Detached Dwelling~~. A detached building containing one dwelling unit, including manufactured homes.

Triplex. Any configuration of three attached, or detached, dwelling units on one Lot or Parcel.

Dwelling Unit. ~~A single unit providing complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.~~

(***)

Multi-family Complex. See *Dwelling, Multi-family Complex*.

Multi-family Dwelling. ~~See *Dwelling, Multi-family*.~~

(***)

//Analysis: Formatting and alphabetizing errors corrected.//

(***)

ARTICLE 1 – ZONING STANDARDS8

Off-Street Parking & Loading Requirements

8.0500 Off-Street Parking. Parking space requirements are based on the following standards according to the use (note: all required handicapped parking is included in the calculation derived parking standards ~~within these charts~~). Manufacturing, warehousing, and other industrial uses may base the number of required parking spaces on the number of employees. When the number of employees is specified, persons counted shall be those working on the premises, including proprietors, during the largest shift at peak season.

Land Use	Standard:
<i>Residential</i>	
All residential uses within the Downtown Overlay District	1 space per Dwelling Unit (DU):-
Apartments Bed and Breakfast Boarding House Caretaker, Watchman living on-site Cottage Clusters / and Cottage Developments Duplex Guest Houses Homeless Shelter Multi Family Complex (over 4 D.U.s) <u>(Apartments)</u> Studio ≤600 sf Studio >600 sf / 1 bedroom 2 bedrooms 3 or more bedrooms Triplex and Quadplex Residential Use other than Ground Floor Residential Use, Ground Floor < 25% Residential Care Facility (6 or more residents) Residential Care Home (5 or less residents) Single Family Detached Dwelling Duplex Townhouse Triplex and Quadplex	2 spaces / DU; 1 space / Mgr., 1 space / 10 DU* plus: 1 space / per bedroom 1 space / per bedroom 2 spaces / per dwelling unit DU 1 space / per cottage 1 space / DU 1 space / per Guest House 4 .5 space / per room, or 1 space / per employee or service provider (fullest shift) <u>1 space / 10 DU; 1 space / Mgr. Plus: 2 spaces /</u> DU; 1 space / Mgr., 1 space / 10 DU 1 space / DU 1.5 space / DU (1 space per Affordable Housing DU) 1.75 spaces / DU (1.5 spaces per Affordable Housing DU) 2 spaces / DU 1 space per DU 2 spaces per DU 2 spaces per DU 4 .5 space / per each 2 rooms , 1 space / employee (fullest shift) 2 spaces 2 spaces / per DU 1 space per DU 1 space / per DU 1 space / DU

(***)

8.0505 Off-Street Parking and Loading. General provisions are as follows:

(***)

2. Requirements for types of buildings and uses not specifically listed in these standards shall be determined by the Community Development Director, or designee ~~Hearings Body~~, based upon the requirements for comparable uses listed.

(***)

5. Off-street parking spaces for Dwelling Units (DU) ~~dwellings~~ shall be located on the same parcel with those dwellings, or written contract of agreement shall be provided to the City that expressly permits shared use of parking areas which are off-site.

(***)

8. In any zone, every building having a gross floor area of 10,000 square feet or more, which is to be occupied for: manufacturing, storage, warehousing, ~~goods display~~, retail sales, a hotel, a hospital, a mortuary, a laundry, dry cleaning establishment, or other uses similar requiring the receipt or distribution by vehicles, or materials or merchandise, shall provide one off-street loading berth, plus one additional loading berth for each additional 20,000 square feet of gross floor area. Each loading berth shall be provided with paved access, driveways and surfacing in the same manner as for off-street parking, except that each space shall be 10 feet wide and 22 feet long with a height clearance of at least 14 feet. A sight-obscuring screen, berm, or landscaping shall conceal all loading areas from view from public streets or roads.

(***)

ARTICLE IV – SITE AND DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS - INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

- 8.3035 Design Review Criteria.** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following applicable criteria shall be met.

(***)

4.E.14 Architectural Requirements / Multi-Family Complexes

(***)

14. **Off-Street Parking.** All off-street parking provisions addressed herein (including: number of spaces; loading areas; and design and improvement standards) shall be provided in conformance with Section 8.0500 through 8.0515 of the ~~City of Redmond Development Code~~. Plexes ~~Triplexes and quadplexes~~ shall comply with the City's access policies regarding vehicle access and provide adequate pedestrian ways to safely navigate the parking areas and to connect to the public sidewalks. Adequate internal vehicle access shall be designed to minimize or eliminate vehicle/vehicle or vehicle/pedestrian conflicts in off-street parking areas. If off-street parking areas are proposed to be placed between the primary building elevations and public streets, the application shall be subject to a public hearing pursuant to Article II – Land Use Procedures, Sections 8.1000

~~through 8.1720 of the City of Redmond Development Code. Parallel parking shall not be permitted on any common or shared driveways or private drives less than 28 feet in width for parking on one side, or less than 36 feet in width for parking on two sides.~~

(***)

//Analysis: Dwelling units with lower capacity need fewer spaces. In addition, lower income households often have fewer vehicles, especially those living in affordable housing units. According to *localhousingsolutions.org*, "By reducing off-street parking, communities can lower development costs, potentially free up land for additional units, and reduce the cost of housing for residents."

Residential guidelines related to the "Ground Floor" and the "Multi-Family Complex" were deemed unnecessary given the previous revision and were removed. Items on the list were alphabetized.//

III. Additional Information/Examples

A) MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS BY CITY (per unit unless otherwise stated)

These numbers represent general development areas and does not represent special districts with exceptions.

City	Population 2020	SFD	Townhome	Duplex	Triplex	Quadplex	Multi-unit Studio	Multi-unit 1 bdr	Multi-unit 2 bdr	Multi-unit 3+ bdr	Multi-unit Affordable	SFD Affordable	Cottage Cluster	Multi-unit Special/Senior Dev	ADU	Comments
Redmond	33,274	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2			1	0.5	N	Under current code
Bend	99,178	2	1	N	N	1	1	1	1.5	2		1	1	0.5	N	
Salem	175,535	2	N	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1/4		
Medford	85,824	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5						
Eugene	176,654	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	.67 (min 3 spaces)				N	
Hood River	8,313	1														1 space all dwellings
Albany	56,472	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	2			1	1/3		Multi-unit guest parking 1 per 4 units
Ashland	21,360	2					1	1.5	1.75	2				1		Plexs same as multi-unit
Hillsboro	106,447	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1		0.25	N	Lower standards near transit lines

B) Midtown Place (Affordable Housing Project) Parking Comparison

47 Units Total	Spaces needed with current RDC standards	Spaces needed with proposed amendment
1 bedroom = 2 units	4	2
2 bedrooms = 41 units	82	61.5
3 bedrooms = 4 units	8	8
Manager	1	1
Guest spaces	5	5
Total spaces required	100	77.5
Spaces per unit	2.12	1.65

C) Feedback from the Local Construction Community

1. Email excerpt from a local contractor, January 18, 2022:

“...the biggest challenge that my design architect team and I are finding when massing thoughtful multifamily communities is the required parking rules. In my experience, it is highly unusual to have a blanket parking requirement for any rental housing unit type. It is often a calculation based on unit bedroom count instead which quite often reflects the actual usage and allows for sites to look less like concrete jungles. One example below is the parking requirement for a suburban city within the Atlanta MSA called Sandy Springs.

Their parking calculation reads as such:

*1bd unit – 1.2 spaces
2bd unit – 1.95 spaces
3bd unit – 2.2 spaces*

For a project with 103 units with a mix below Redmond current code requires 222 parking spaces (guest included) and under the above structure there would be 193 spaces (w/10 guest spaces added 183 if the assumption is that the calculation accounts for those).

*1bd – 34 units
2bd – 54 units
3bd – 18 units*

While the cost of the additional 30 parking spaces is roughly \$225k, losing the developable land to a use that is under-utilized is far more expensive as it eliminates the option for additional housing units and forces one to design sites that are less beautiful concrete jungles.”

2. Email excerpt from Housing Works (Affordable), September 30, 2022:

“Thank you for looking at parking requirements for multifamily! A ratio of 1.6 parking spaces per unit is a really good start. Not to nerd out too much on this but you may want to have subcategories of multifamily with different parking requirements. For example, a senior 55+ apartment community we have found only needs about .75 parking spaces per unit as these communities are predominately 1 bedroom and not everyone has a car. Workforce properties with 2 and 3 bedroom units definitely will need a higher ratio of parking. I believe Bend has a ratio of 1 parking spot per 1 bedroom unit, 1.5 for 2 bedroom units, and 2 per 3 bedroom units and seems to fit our developments well. Our design intent is to make sure we are not pushing cars into the surrounding neighborhood or plugging up a street in front of the property.”



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session
HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
REVIEWING STAFF: John Roberts, Deputy City Manager
Kyle Roberts, Planning Director
TOPIC: Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)

I. Purpose

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and **in Red or Red Underline**.

MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS & PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

(***)

8.0275 Planned Unit Development (PUD).

1. **Purpose and Applicability.** The purpose of a PUD is to:
 - A. Permit greater flexibility in land use regulations in all zones **(e.g., reduction of minimum lot size requirements)**.
 - B. Encourage creative developments.
 - C. Incentivize a variety of land uses and housing types, mixed use, the economy of shared services and facilities, public amenities, and developments compatible with the surrounding area and neighborhoods.
 - D. Promote and encourage infill development, flexibility in improvements on lots, and affordable and workforce housing.
 - E. Encourage preservation of natural features and enhancement of the area vegetation.
 - F. Facilitate sustainable design, energy efficiency, desirable aesthetics, and efficient use of open space.

Density requirements, setbacks, land use regulations, and required improvements may be adjusted to allow for a more creative, functional, and desirable living environment. In return for greater flexibility in site design and development, the PUD process introduces special requirements and standards for approval.

2. **Approval.** PUD approval is subject to:

- A. Land use review and approval as Conditional Use.
- B. Zoning standards, except as modified by the PUD.
- C. Subdivision and Partitions Standards, except as modified by the PID.
- D. Site and Design Review Standards, except as modified by the PUD.
- E. PUD Standards and Requirements.
- ~~F. A public hearing with the Hearings Body following the procedure described in Land Use Administrative actions allowed under Article II.~~

(***)

5. **Review Procedure for PUD's.** The following procedure shall be followed in requesting approval of a PUD.

- A. A pre-development meeting is required prior to submittal of an application.
- ~~B.~~ B. Proof a neighborhood meeting was conducted to for development proposals that generate 200 or more daily trip ends, or 20 or more p.m. peak hour trip ends, where a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) is required, See Section 8.0385 for meeting requirements.
- ~~C.B.~~ C.B. An applicant shall submit an electronic version of the complete application. The plan shall contain and show, at an engineer's scale of no less than 1" = 10', the following information:
 - 1. The relationship of the property to the surrounding area.
 - 2. The preliminary plan of subdivision or re-subdivision, if any, which shall include the information required by the Subdivision Ordinance.
 - 3. Land uses, building locations, density proposed, architectural style, efficiency measures, housing market served, and number of dwelling units.
 - 4. The arrangement of streets and pedestrian ways.
 - 5. Proposals that include reduced yards and lot size shall be designed to be served by private alleys or drives.
 - 6. The location of off-street parking spaces, and a parking management plan if the total number of spaces required exceeds 75.
 - 7. The location of service commercial areas, open space, recreational area, common areas, or park.
 - 8. Plans for site grading and drainage.
 - 9. Plans for water supply and sewage disposal.
 - 10. Plans for transfer of ownership of the property, if any, and arrangements for maintenance of common areas and facilities.
 - 11. Landscape plan including the list of species proposed and size/coverage at time of planting and at five years.
 - 12. Proposed project timing schedule and surety, if required by City.
- ~~D.G.~~ D.G. In considering the PUD, the City shall determine:
 - 1. There are special development objectives or physical conditions which justify a request for a PUD.
 - 2. The PUD will contain buffers on sides of the development that abut neighboring properties.
 - 3. The PUD, through its design and function, will improve livability for planned residents.
 - 4. The PUD contains a mix of housing types, variety of uses or services.
 - 5. The PUD can be completed within 5 years or phased for later development.
 - 6. The PUD will not overload adjacent streets, utilities, or infrastructure.
 - 7. The PUD will be consistent with the objectives of Area Plans and the

Redmond Comprehensive Plan.

- E.D. The City Shall notify the applicant whether in its judgment the foregoing provisions have been satisfied and, if not, whether they can be satisfied with other alternatives or revision to the PUD.

(***)

//Analysis: The PUD standards and process were revised significantly as part of the recent RDC updates adopted in June of 2022. The revisions were spurred primarily by feedback from the development community regarding the narrow scope of application of the existing PUD standards.

The PUD provisions have been modified to encourage creativity and flexibility to existing standards, in lieu of providing community benefits. The provisions attempt to be clear and objective and define important items. However, it has been noted that developers are reluctant to use the PUD process because of costs, time and required legislative process through the Planning Commission.

PUDs are a proven tool that could provide benefits to developers and the community. The cost of a PUD is cheaper than a Master Development Plan and structured to be equivalent to a subdivision. To incentivize the use, the public hearing requirement was modified. A public hearing would only be required if the proposal generates 200 or more daily trip ends, or 20 or more p.m. peak hour trip ends, where a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) is required. This is the same public hearing standard for a Master Development Plan or wireless and broadcast communication facility.//



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session
HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
REVIEWING STAFF: Jessica MacClanahan, City Engineer
Lindsey Crowsigt, Assistant City Engineer
David Pilling, Engineering Development Manager
TOPIC: Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)

I. Purpose

- Modifies regulatory criteria to allow City Engineering to review and approve Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) prior to land use completeness acceptance.

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and in Red or Red Underline.

MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS & PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

8.0270 Master Development Plans. A Master Development Plan is required as a condition of annexation, or after annexation, but prior to or concurrent with rezoning from Urban Holding-10 to other City zoning districts. The specific requirements for a Master Development Plan are:

(***)

3. Procedures for Review.

(***)

C. Master Development Plan (MDP) or Partial Master Development Plan (PMDP) Submittal Requirements and Approval Process.

An application for approval shall include the submittal requirements set forth in the City's Land Use Review application form as well as the elements described below.

(***)

- 11. Transportation Analysis and Diagram.** Prepare a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) including a grid street plan that is consistent with street spacing

- and connectivity guidelines in the *Redmond Transportation System Plan* (TSP) and adopted Area or Framework Plans. The TIA shall identify and sShow:
- A. ~~T~~the proposed classification for all streets. ~~down to collector roadways.~~
 - B. ~~Show~~ Ithe location of approved TSP improvement projects.
 - C. ~~and~~ Aany capital improvements that may need to be added to the TSP in order to serve the plan area.
 - D. ~~Show~~ Proposed bicycle pedestrian, and trail routes.
 - E. ~~Show~~ Demonstrate how planned transportation facilities will connect to transportation facilities in adjacent urban areas.

(***)

ARTICLE II - LAND USE PROCEDURES - INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

8.1010 Application Requirements.

1. Applications for development actions or land use actions shall:

- A. Be submitted by the property owner or a person who represents in writing that he or she has authority from the property owner as defined herein to make the application;
- B. Be completed on a form prescribed by the Community Development Director, or designee;
- C. Be filed with a Transportation Impact Analysis, approved by City Engineering, when required per Section 8.2815;
- D.G. Be filed with a narrative statement or Burden of Proof, explaining how the application satisfies each and all of the relevant criteria and standards in sufficient detail for review and decision-making; and
- E.D. Be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee.

(***)

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION PROCEDURE

8.2200 Pre-Application Meeting. Prior to submitting a tentative subdivision plat each applicant or their representative is required to meet with the Community Development Director or a designated staff member(s) to review the proposal.

(***)

2. Information concerning existing conditions:

(***)

- K. Existing covenants, conditions, and restrictions.
- L. Conditions specified on the approved A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared in accordance with Section 8.2815 ~~of this Code.~~

(***)

8.2236 Subdivisions may be created following two tracks: Track 1 (General) and Track 2 (Clear and Objective Standards).

1. **Track 1 – General Criteria. Subdivision Tentative Plans (No ‘Needed Housing’).** The City shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a proposed subdivision. Approval, or approval with conditions shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

(***)

- K. The proposal complies with the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Review provisions per Section 8.2815.

(***)

2. **Track 2 – Subdivision, Tentative Plan Approval Criteria (‘Needed Housing’ & Clear and Objective Standards).** The planning division shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny a proposed subdivision. Approval, or approval with conditions, shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

(***)

- I. The proposed subdivision complies with the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Review provisions per Section 8.2815.

(***)

DESIGN STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENTS

(***)

8.2710 Streets.

2. **Existing Streets.** Whenever existing streets, adjacent to or within a tract, are of inadequate width per City of Redmond Standards and Specifications and the City’s approved Transportation System Plan ~~to accommodate the increase in traffic expected from the land division or by the City’s transportation policies as determined through a transportation impact analysis,~~ additional right-of-way shall be provided at the time of the land division by the applicant. During consideration of the tentative plat for the subdivision or partition, the Hearings Body shall determine whether the improvements to existing streets, adjacent to or within the tract, are required. If so determined, such improvements shall be required as a condition of approval of the tentative plat. Improvements to adjacent streets shall be required where traffic on said streets shall be directly affected by the proposed subdivision.

(***)

SUPPLEMENTARY PROVISIONS

(***)

- 8.2815 Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA).** It shall be the burden of the developer to evaluate transportation system impacts ~~through studies prepared by a qualified registered professional engineer. When a transportation impact analysis is required, it must demonstrate that the following standards are met:~~ when a proposed development involves either a Subdivision, Site and Design Review, PUD, Master Plan,

Comprehensive Plan Amendments, a change or expansion of use, or any other development that the City Engineer deems necessary.

1. The following vehicle trip generation thresholds shall determine the level and scope of transportation analysis required for a new or expanded development. Trip ends shall be calculated as per the Institute of Transportation Engineers manual, Trip Generation, current edition, or local trip generation studies prepared by a qualified registered professional engineer and approved by the City Engineer.
 - A. A development will be required to provide a Trip Generation Report per Section 8.2815(2) for developments which generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips. The Trip Generation Report shall be prepared by a professional engineer licensed in the state of Oregon. The Engineering Department will review and evaluate the Trip Generation Report to determine if a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) is required.

Projects that generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour trip ends may be required to provide a TIA when, in the opinion of the City Engineer or his/her designee, significant capacity and/or safety problem is caused, or adversely impacted by the development. The City Engineer, or designee, shall determine the scope of this analysis.
 - B. If a proposed development will generate 200 or more daily trip ends, or 20 or more p.m. peak hour trip ends, then a TIA shall be required per Section 8.2815(3). The TIA shall bear the stamp and signature of a licensed professional engineer especially qualified in traffic engineering by the State of Oregon. The City Engineer shall determine when a TIA has satisfied the requirements of the development's impact analysis.
2. When a Trip Generation Report is required, it must demonstrate the existing use, proposed use, existing trips per the ITE, and proposed trips per the ITE. Local trip rates may also be considered if supported by traffic counts conducted according to ITE guidelines. The report must include a conceptual site plan that shows adjacent roadways, alleys, roadway classifications, and access points.
3. When a TIA is required, it must demonstrate that the following standards are met:
 - A.1. The standard of measurement that will determine the acceptability of traffic flow on City streets will be a delay-based level of service as defined by the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, third Edition (2000 update or subsequent document updates) published by the Transportation Research Board. The determination of LOS shall be calculated by a methodology that is approved by the City Engineer. The acceptable standard of LOS for City streets shall be LOS E during the peak 15 minutes of the peak hours of the average weekday. A lesser standard shall be acceptable at unsignalized intersections with low volume minor street approaches if the volume-to-capacity ratio is less than 0.90 and the 95th percentile vehicle queue is less than four vehicles during the peak hour.
 - B.2. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume of Local Street roadways within the City of Redmond shall be less than 1,200 vehicles per day (VPD). Developments which add vehicle trips to Local Streets with an ADT greater than 1,200 VPD may be asked to provide mitigation in the form of additional access to the site, when in the opinion of the City Engineer, the residential livability is degraded by excessive local street traffic volume.

- C.3- New development that will cause degradation below those levels shall be required to provide mitigating transportation system improvements that will restore the LOS to the accepted standard, as is practical, as determined by the City Engineer and pursuant to the adopted City's s of Redmond Transportation System Plan. Where there are impacts to the State Highways, the City and ODOT shall work cooperatively to determine appropriate courses of action based on ODOT and City standards.
- ~~4.~~ The following vehicle trip generation thresholds shall determine the level and scope of transportation analysis required for a new or expanded development. Trip ends shall be calculated as per the Institute of Transportation Engineers manual, Trip Generation, 8th edition (or subsequent document updates), or local trip generation studies prepared by a qualified registered professional engineer and approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer shall determine when a TIA has satisfied the requirements of the development's impact analysis. The TIA shall bear the stamp and signature of a qualified registered professional Engineer with a license valid in the State of Oregon.
- ~~A.~~ If a proposed development will generate 200 or more daily trip ends, or 20 or more p.m. peak hour trip ends, then a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be required.
- ~~B.~~ Projects that generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour trip ends may also be required to provide a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) when, in the opinion of the City Engineer or his/her designee, significant capacity and/or safety problem is caused, or adversely impacted by the development. The City Engineer, or designee, shall determine the scope of this analysis.
- ~~C.~~ A development may be required to provide a Trip Generation Report for developments which generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.
- 4.5- The TIA impact analysis area shall include at a minimum, the following intersections:
- A. All site access intersections.
- B. Nearest intersecting collector or arterial street upstream and downstream of the development.
- C. Any other collector or arterial street intersection that would experience an increase of 25 additional peak hour trips.
- D. Additional intersections requested by staff in the basis of anticipated impacts resulting from the development.
- 5.6- The TIA analysis shall include the following study time frames addressing:
- A. Existing conditions.
- B. Completion year of each significant phase of development.
- C. Five year forecast beyond final phase.
- 6.7- The following Tables are required in the TIA:
- A. Trip Generation (including phase breakdown if applicable)
- B. LOS Table (LOS for every analysis scenario at every study area intersection. Report LOS, delay, V/C ratio, 95% vehicle queue, and any additional pertinent analysis results)
- 7.8- The following Figures are required in the TIA:
- A. Vicinity/Locator Map.
- B. Site or Tentative Plan Map.
- C. Background Traffic Volumes (all study intersections and ,all analysis years)
- D. Trip Distribution and Assignment.
- E. Background + Site Generated Traffic Volumes (all study intersections and ,all analysis years).
- 8.9- Other Analysis Standards (as required by the study)

- A. Signal Warrants shall be performed where applicable per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, current edition.
- B. Left Turn Lane Warrants shall be provided where applicable per ODOT criteria based on the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) curves.
- C. Right Turn Lane Warrants shall be provided where applicable per ODOT criteria.
- D. The acceptability of sight distance at all study area intersections shall be determined per AASHTO (current edition) standards.
- E. Traffic signal progression analysis may be required if a new signal is proposed. The City Engineer shall approve the method of traffic signal progression analysis.
- F. Roadway improvements are to be based on the City of Redmond Standards and Specifications and ODOT design standards.

8.2820 Access Management Standards. All land use approvals divisions shall be in compliance with the following standards.

1. Driveway spacing and corner clearance as follows:

Roadway Classification	Minimum Access Driveway Spacing	Minimum Access Clearance to Corner	Intersection Spacing (Min.)
Local	No restrictions	30 feet	165 feet
Minor Collector	50 feet	80 feet	330 feet
Major Collector	165 feet	165 feet	330 feet
Minor Arterial	330 feet	330 feet	¼ mile
Major Arterial	ODOT Stds	ODOT Stds	ODOT Stds

(***)

4. Access shall be taken from the lower order street or alley unless otherwise approved by Public Works and/or ODOT through the land use review and approval process. Access to higher order streets may be allowed for emergency vehicles when restricted with a locked fire gate, bollards or similar, when approved or required by Redmond Fire and Rescue.
5. Unless adequate demonstration of site necessity, intersection safety and functionality are provided, through the land use review process, new lots and/or parcels will be limited to a single vehicular access. Existing lots may be permitted a secondary access when approved by the City Engineer.

(***)

9. Public Works may require supporting information, including but not limited to traffic count data, trip generation, trip distribution, truck and trailer turning/backing templates and/or on-site circulation diagram, Transportation Impact Analysis study, etc., in order to make a proper determination of access/driveway location.
10. Access/driveway locations may require alignment with existing driveways on the opposite side of the roadway as determined by Public Works or through the land use review and approval process.

- ~~11.~~ 10. Access within the North Redmond US 97 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) shall also conform to the 2007 "North Redmond US 97 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP)", as amended, provision of Chapter 9 Transportation Element of the

8.3030 Special Studies, Investigations and Reports. Special studies, investigations and reports may be required to ensure that the proposed development of a particular site does not adversely affect the surrounding community, does not create hazardous conditions for persons or improvements on the site. These may include traffic impact analysis, or trip generation or parking studies/reports, impact of contaminated soils, soil conditions, flooding of waters and excessive storm water runoff, tree preservation, and other concerns of the development's impact on adjacent properties or public facilities.

1. ~~A traffic generation statement prepared by a licensed Professional Engineer may be required at the time of application submittal at the discretion of the City Engineer, or designee.~~ An approved Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) will be required prior to land use application completeness acceptance. A TIA approval memorandum, issued by the City Engineering, shall be included with the application submittal per Section 8.1010.

(***)

8.3035 Design Review Criteria. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following applicable criteria shall be met.

(***)

8. The development must meet requirements per Section 8.2815 (Traffic Impact Analysis) (TIA)
 - A. ~~The following vehicle trip generation thresholds shall determine the level and scope of transportation analysis required for a new or expanded development. Trip ends shall be calculated as per the current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers manual, Trip Generation, or local trip generation studies prepared by a qualified registered professional engineer and approved by the City Engineer. The City Engineer shall determine when a TIA has satisfied the requirements of the development's impact analysis. The TIA shall bear the stamp and signature of a qualified registered professional Engineer with a license valid in the State of Oregon.~~
 1. ~~If a proposed development will generate 200 or more daily trip ends, or 20 or more p.m. peak hour trip ends, then a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be required.~~
 2. ~~Projects that generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour trip ends may also be required to provide a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) when, in the opinion of the City Engineer, or his/her/its designee, significant capacity and/or safety problem is caused, or adversely impacted by the development. The City Engineer, or designee, shall determine the scope of this analysis.~~
 3. ~~A development may be required to provide a Trip Generation Report for developments which generate less than 200 daily or 20 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.~~
 - B. ~~The impact analysis area shall include at a minimum, the following intersections:~~
 1. ~~All site access intersections~~
 2. ~~Nearest intersecting collector or arterial street upstream and downstream of the development.~~
 3. ~~Any other collector or arterial street intersection that would experience an~~

- increase of 25 additional peak hour trips.
4. ~~Additional intersections requested by staff.~~
- C. ~~The analysis shall include the following study time frames:~~
1. ~~Existing conditions.~~
 2. ~~Completion year of each significant phase of development.~~
 3. ~~Five year forecast beyond final phase.~~
- D. ~~The following Tables are required in the TIA:~~
1. ~~Trip Generation (including phase breakdown if applicable)~~
 2. ~~LOS Table (LOS for every analysis scenario at every study area intersection. Report LOS, delay, v/c ratio, 95% vehicle queue, and any additional pertinent analysis results)~~
- E. ~~The following Figures are required in the TIA:~~
1. ~~Vicinity Map~~
 2. ~~Site or Tentative Plan Map~~
 3. ~~Background Traffic Volumes (all study intersections, all analysis years)~~
 4. ~~Trip Distribution and Assignment~~
 5. ~~Background + Site Generated Traffic Volumes (all study intersections, all analysis years)~~
- F. ~~Other Analysis Standards (as required by the study)~~
1. ~~Signal Warrants shall be performed where applicable per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, current edition.~~
 2. ~~Left Turn Lane Warrants shall be provided where applicable per ODOT criteria based on the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) curves.~~
 3. ~~Right Turn Lane Warrants shall be provided where applicable per ODOT criteria.~~
 4. ~~The acceptability of sight distance at all study area intersections shall be determined per AASHTO (current edition) standards.~~
 5. ~~Traffic signal progression analysis may be required if a new signal is proposed. The City Engineer shall approve the method of traffic signal progression analysis.~~
 6. ~~Roadway improvements are to be based on the City of Redmond Standards and Specifications and ODOT design standards.~~

9. The development must meet requirements per Section 8.2820 Access Management Standards. City of Redmond Access Management Standards. All land use approvals shall comply with the following standards.

- A. ~~Driveway spacing and corner clearance as follows:~~

Roadway Classification	Minimum Access Driveway Spacing	Minimum Access Clearance Corner	Intersection Spacing
Local Street	No Restrictions	30 feet	165 feet
Minor Collector	80 feet	80 feet	330 feet
Major Collector	165 feet	165 feet	330 feet
Minor Arterial	330 feet	330 feet	¼ mile
Major Arterial	ODOT Stds	ODOT Stds	ODOT Stds

- B. ~~In all instances, access near an intersection shall be located beyond the influence of standing queues and opposing left turns sharing a continuous two-way left turn lane. This requirement may result in greater corner clearance or access spacing than the minimum distance indicated.~~
- C. ~~Every lot or parcel shall be permitted an access. In the event that the access~~

management standards cannot be achieved, shared access with adjacent property shall be explored and provided where available.

- ~~D. Access shall be taken from the lower order street or alley unless otherwise approved by Public Works and/or ODOT through the land use process.~~
- ~~E. Unless adequate demonstration of site necessity, intersection safety and functionality, lots, parcels and/or developments will be limited to a single access as determined by Public Works through the land use process.~~
- ~~F. The access management standards apply to new development, redevelopment, subdivision, and partitioning of land.~~
- ~~G. Corner clearance is measured from the edge of right of way to the nearest edge of access. Spacing is measured from centerline of access/ intersection to centerline of access/intersection.~~
- ~~H. Adequate intersection sight distance and clear zone shall be maintained at all access/driveway locations per AASHTO standards (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials).~~
- ~~I. Access/driveway locations may require alignment with existing driveways on the opposite side of the roadway as determined by Public Works.~~
- ~~J. Public Works may require supporting information, including but not limited to traffic count data, trip generation, trip distribution, Transportation Impact Analysis study, etc., in order to make a proper determination of access/driveway location.~~
- ~~K. Access within the North Redmond US 97 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) shall also conform to the "North Redmond US 97 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP)" provisions of Chapter 9 Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan Addendum and Policy 12 n of Chapter 14 of the Comprehensive Plan. (Amended by City Ordinance 2007-09, effective June 8, 2007)~~

10. ~~Transportation Impact Analysis.~~ It shall be the burden of the developer to evaluate transportation system impacts through studies prepared by a qualified registered professional engineer. When a transportation impact analysis is required, it must demonstrate that the following standards are met:

- ~~L. The standard of measurement that will determine the acceptability of traffic flow on City streets will be a delay based level of service as defined by the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Third Edition (2000 update or subsequent document updates) published by the Transportation Research Board. The determination of LOS shall be calculated by a methodology that is approved by the City Engineer. The acceptable standard of LOS for City streets shall be LOS E during the peak 15 minutes of the peak hour of the average weekday. A lesser standard shall be acceptable at unsignalized intersections with low volume minor street approaches if the volume to capacity ratio is less than 0.90 and the 95th percentile vehicle queue is less than four vehicles during the peak hour.~~
- ~~M. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume of Local Street roadways within the City of Redmond shall be less than 1,200 vehicles per day (VPD). Developments which add vehicle trips to Local Streets with an ADT greater than 1,200 VPD may be asked to provide mitigation in the form of additional access to the site, when in the opinion of the City Engineer, the residential livability is degraded by excessive local street traffic volume.~~
- ~~N. New development that will cause degradation below those levels shall be required to provide mitigating transportation system improvements that will restore the LOS to the accepted standard, as is practical, as determined by the City Engineer. Where there are impacts to the State Highways, the City and ODOT shall work cooperatively to determine appropriate courses of action based on ODOT and City standards.~~

(***)

//Analysis: The proposed amendment modifies regulatory criteria to allow the City Engineering to review and approve Transportation Impact Analyses (TIA) prior to land use application completeness acceptance.

The current process requires Engineering to review TIAs after a land use application is deemed complete, within the 120-day review period ('shot-clock'). Typically, TIAs require several rounds of review with the Engineer of Record prior to concurrence. As part of this process Engineering may ask for additional information such as traffic counts, studies of intersections, cost estimates for public improvements, vehicular access and circulation diagrams, or any other information that could require the applicant to hire a Professional Traffic Engineer and/or conduct field investigations to complete the study. The results of the information may affect the overall site plan for the development.

The 120-day mandated review period creates a time constraint on the TIA review and occasionally Engineering is not able to obtain the information needed to make required conditions of approval prior to decision issuance. By moving the TIA review prior to land use completeness acceptance, Engineering will be able to fully review and approve a TIA and have complete conditions of approval prepared for the land use decision. This change will streamline land use application review, as Engineering will have its transportation-related conditions of approval determined prior to completeness check.//



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session
HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission
REVIEWING STAFF: Kyle Roberts, Planning Director
Sarah Vowell, Assistant Planner
TOPIC: Off-street Parking Requirement for Plexes

I. Purpose

- Clearly specify the minimum required off-street parking spaces for plex developments to improve administration of the RDC.

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and **in Red or Red Underline**.

**ARTICLE I - ZONING STANDARDS
SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS AND PLEXES DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN
STANDARDS**

8.0141 Single Family Detached Dwellings and Plexes Development and Design Standards.

(***)

6. Driveways and Garages.

- a. A garage is required for each newly constructed residential structure **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**5** through 8.0515 (Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements) of the RDC.
 - i. Manufactured homes may meet this standard by substituting a garage with covered parking or carport.
 - ii. Triplexes and quadplexes may meet this standard by substituting garage or covered parking with uncovered, paved parking spot(s) per the design requirements in Section 8.0500**5** through 8.0515.
- b. Driveways 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 Redmond Development Code.
- c. A single-family detached home that adds an ADU shall continue to meet the minimum parking spaces requirement for the primary home.
 - d. Notwithstanding the applicable provisions of Sections 8.0500~~5~~ through 8.0515 (Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements) of the RDC, all required off street parking areas and driveways constructed in conjunction with single family detached dwellings or plexes may have alternative surfaces to concrete or asphalt and may include permeable surfaces to the extent they provide an all-weather surface sufficient for vehicular travel. Loose gravel, aggregate and similar surface treatments are not permitted for required parking spaces.

7. Off-street Parking. The minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for single-family detached dwellings and plexes are specified in Section 8.0500.

78. Landscaping. See Section 8.03440.

89. Fences. See Section 8.0340.

910. Conversions. Conversion of an existing single-family detached dwelling to a duplex, triplex, or quadplex is allowed, provided that the conversion does not increase non-conformance with applicable standards of the underlying zone and this section.

//Analysis: The latest code amendment to Section 8.0141 inadvertently created wording that one garage and one driveway, as few as two parking spaces total, could be proposed for a triplex or quadplex. While it's required to have a garage and driveway that can accommodate at least one off-street parking space for each residential *structure*, one off-street parking space must be provided per *dwelling unit* as specified in Section 8.0500.

The recommendation adds one sentence that will direct users to Section 8.0500 to ensure that the total minimum off-street parking spaces is correctly applied for plex developments.//



CITY OF REDMOND
Community Development Department

411 SW 9th Street
Redmond, OR 97756
Ph: (541) 923-7721
www.redmondoregon.gov

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS
TO THE REDMOND CITY CODE, CHAPTER 8
REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE (RDC)**

PREPARED FOR: November 14, 2022, Planning Commission Work Session
November 15, 2022, City Council Work Session

HEARINGS BODY: Redmond Urban Area Planning Commission

REVIEWING STAFF: Kyle Roberts, Planning Director
Sarah Vowell, Assistant Planner

TOPIC: Landscaping Standards for Single-Family Detached Dwellings,
Plexes, and Townhouses

I. Purpose

- Correct Sections 8.0141 and 8.0142 to establish landscaping requirements and improve administration of the RDC.

II. Proposed Amendment to RDC

Proposed text amendments are shown in ~~strike-through~~ and in Red or Red Underline.

**ARTICLE I - ZONING STANDARDS
SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS AND PLEXES DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN
STANDARDS**

**8.0141 Single Family Detached Dwellings and Plexes Development and Design
Standards.**

(***)

78. Landscaping. ~~See Section 8.03440.~~ Landscaping standards are as follows:

- On all lots which new single-family detached dwellings or plexes are constructed, landscaping shall be installed between the corresponding façade(s) of the structure and the edge of the street(s), public or private, for the entire length of the street frontage(s).
- Required landscaping can include, but is not limited to, a combination of the following materials: living plant material such as trees, shrubs, flowers, and lawn; and non-living materials such as walkways and courtyards consisting of brick, concrete, asphalt, decorative rock, or other approved materials. Applicable landscaping requirements are subject to the following:

- i. Xeriscaping is encouraged. The minimum required allowance for plantings shall be 25%. Rock, rock gardens and bark areas without plantings do not qualify as landscaping or xeriscaping.
- ii. The use of gravel is limited to spaces specified for the parking of RVs.
- iii. Areas of exposed dirt are not allowed.
- c. Street trees are required to be installed on all residential lots fronting on public or private streets, including lots already platted at the time of adoption of this ordinance, but not yet developed. Additional standards are located in Section 8.3035.5.K.

<u>Lot Width</u>	<u>Number of Street Trees Required</u>
<u>Corner Lot</u>	<u>Tree requirements will be based on each street frontage length.</u>
<u>50 feet and less</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>51-100 feet</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>101-150 feet</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>151 feet and more</u>	<u>One tree/40 feet of width fronting street.</u>

- i. Flag lots shall be exempt from street tree requirements unless the frontage portion of the flag lot is 30' or greater.
- d. All landscaping and street tree installation shall be completed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

(***)

8.0142 Townhouse Development and Design Standards.

(***)

- 5. **Design Standards.** New townhouses shall meet the design standards in subsections A through F of this section.

(***)

- E. **Landscaping.** ~~See Section 8.3035(5).~~ Landscaping standards are as follows:
 - a. On all lots which new townhouses are constructed, landscaping shall be installed between the corresponding façade(s) of the structure and the edge of the street(s), public or private, for the entire length of the street frontage(s).
 - b. Required landscaping can include, but is not limited to, a combination of the following materials: living plant material such as trees, shrubs, flowers, and lawn; and non-living materials such as walkways and courtyards consisting of brick, concrete, asphalt, decorative rock, or other approved materials. Applicable landscaping requirements are subject to the following:

- i. Xeriscaping is encouraged. The minimum required allowance for plantings shall be 25%. Rock, rock gardens and bark areas without plantings do not qualify as landscaping or xeriscaping.
- ii. The use of gravel is limited to spaces specified for the parking of RVs.
- iii. Areas of exposed dirt are not allowed.
- c. Street trees are required to be installed on all residential lots fronting on public or private streets, including lots already platted at the time of adoption of this ordinance, but not yet developed. Additional standards are located in Section 8.3035.5.K.

<u>Lot Width</u>	<u>Number of Street Trees Required</u>
<u>Corner Lot</u>	<u>Tree requirements will be based on each street frontage length</u>
<u>50 feet and less</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>51-100 feet</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>101-150 feet</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>151 feet and more</u>	<u>One tree/40 feet of width fronting street</u>

- i. Flag lots shall be exempt from street tree requirements unless the frontage portion of the flag lot is 30' or greater.
- d. All landscaping and street tree installation shall be completed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

(***)

//Analysis: Through a scrivener's error, the current single-family detached dwellings and plexes code (Section 8.0141) cites and directs users to an incorrect section for landscaping standards. Additionally, for townhouse landscaping standards, the current code directs users to the landscaping standards in Section 8.3035, Site & Design Review. These landscaping standards are better suited for multi-family complexes and commercial and industrial developments.

The recommendation adds back the landscaping requirements from the previous RDC, references the street tree section from Section 8.3035.5, and provides additional clarification to aid users in submissions of new single-family detached dwellings, plexes, and townhouses developments.//