



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, December 5, 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 December 5th)

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

Ron
Osmundson,
Vice-Chair

Heather DeWolf

Norman
Schultz

Richard Bryant

Joseph
Zampko

Vacancy

Ex-Officio
Vacancy

- I. CALL TO ORDER / INTRODUCTIONS
- II. CITIZEN COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - a. November 14, 2022
- IV. 2023 PLANNING COMMISSION WORKPLAN
- IV. Next Meeting – January 9, 2023
- V. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS
- VI. 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

November 14, 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*, Lindsey Crowsigt, *Assistant City Engineer*, Sarah Vowell, *Assistant Planner*, Jamie Christofferson, *Planning Permit Coordinator*.

Visitors: None

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., November 14, 2022, with a quorum present (6 of 6 commissioners).

II. CITIZEN COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 3, 2022

B. October 17, 2022

Commissioner Osmundson moved to approve the October 3, 2022, minutes and October 17, 2022, minutes as presented, seconded by Commissioner Bryant. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. REDMOND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE (WORK SESSION)

A. RDC Amendments: Timeline & Adoption Schedule

Deputy City Manager John Roberts walked through the PowerPoint presentation Staff intends to give City Council at Work Session #2 for November 15, 2022. The commission will not deliberate on one or two redundant issues therein unless the commissioners want to. He recapped Council's direction to adopt a second round of code amendments no later than December 2022, and the process is on schedule. He reviewed the timeline and adoption schedule, noting the big decision points will be the Planning Commission hearing next Monday and then the public hearing for City Council on December 13th. The process has been open for individual meetings with anyone who wanted them.

The first topic in the presentation is to overview feedback received at the October 11th work session that Staff thinks is sufficiently addressed or is addressed through minor modifications since made to the amendments:

- It was noted the Expedited Land Division had a tighter timeline at 63 days which is the case as it is a statutory mandate and part of the land division process.
- Council noted regarding the new zoning district M-1.5 that going through a rezoning process could be rather extensive and expensive, asking could allowances be made in M-1.5 to allow for heavy industrial and light industrial uses. Staff has written the zoning district so that uses in either zone can be entertained through a conditional use permit process, meaning uses allowed in 1.5 and apply them to light industrial or to heavy industrial.
- Cottage code currently does not require a garage. Redmond used to have three separate cottage standards, but as part of the last code amendment they were winnowed down to two: cottage clusters and cottage developments. Staff will endeavor to address this item more thoroughly in 2023 and meld the two standards together. Whether a garage is required warrants a more in-depth discussion as it is a significant topic as part of all cluster developments.
- Council asked about amenities required for pocket parks, specifically for turf. With amendments in June 2022 for pocket park standards Staff reduced some of the thresholds, giving more flexibility for examples of amenities but tried to give more latitude in terms of the mix of the amenities. Turf is not an outright requirement, but it is encouraged.
- Staff massaged the definition of recreational vehicle and recreational vehicle parks to better align with state statute. Council asked if there were two or more RVs, would they constitute an RV park that would be subject to the safe parking program. The simple answer is no. Vehicles in Mountain View Fellowship's safe parking program would not be considered an RV park because they are temporary in nature.
- Could parking in-lieu be applied to affordable housing projects? Although it is an exclusive tool for the Downtown Overlay District, Staff took some of the principles and applied them to multi-family complex parking.
- There are many different scenarios in the community regarding existing structures. Is there an allowance to permit those structures if they do not conform to setback standards? It is written into the regulations are provisions to allow the City to administratively look at legal non-conforming structures and what type of impacts they have on the surrounding neighborhood.
- Stakeholders requested the City reevaluate minimum lot sizes. COBA presented to Planning Commission at the October 17th work session. The topic will no longer be revisited as part of these amendments.

The second item regards feedback received at the October work session that had a little bit more depth to it, meaning it required some additional research or might need addressed more thoroughly in 2023. Staff received three items in this vein from Council:

- As part of planning presentations and materials, visuals need to be used more often such as diagrams, pictures, and real-life examples to help convey tricky concepts and terms. Staff will be conscientious of this moving forward, even attempting to do so a little more in this presentation.
- There is a desire to learn more about how an affordable housing project is financed, whether it is at 60 percent, 80 percent, 100 percent, public-private partnership. It is a good example of a future panel discussion where experts are enlisted to speak to the topic.
- With regard to ADU setbacks and rear setbacks, does the code have the tools embedded to allow for creative design to maximize living space, whether in the back which means less parking in the front, etc. Staff thinks the code does have the tools, and maybe there will be a couple things in the presentation that will display why they think so.

[Proceeded to Item C]

B. Multi-family Complex Building Window Alignment

Planning Director Kyle Roberts discussed the adjoining window alignment standard of the multi-family complex design standards (Page 15 of the packet). He gave the example of two apartment complex structures next to each other with windows on two walls, are basically adjoining each other, and the structures are closer than 30 feet apart where the standard does not allow for adjoining windows when 30 feet or less apart. It is a good standard because it provides for privacy. Unfortunately, if applicants find they cannot meet the standard, they simply remove windows which the city does not like to see or encourage.

Staff did not want to get rid of the standard because it has a purpose. They thought a potential fix would be to add that frosted windows or similar are exempt from the standard. In talking with Sean Cook, the principal planner who does a lot of the reviews for multi-family complexes, he said it seems like more often than not they are bathroom windows which means frosted makes sense.

He confirmed the city is not encouraging a row of apartments all the same with a never-ending no-design wall of windows. The multi-family complex standards have a whole list of criteria to ensure good design.

[Proceeded to Item F]

C. Multi-family Complex Off-street Parking Requirements

Mr. John Roberts discussed off-street parking requirements for multi-family complexes which are five or more units. Redmond requires two parking spaces per unit, regardless of size which is a rigorous standard when compared to other development codes. Some of the analysis is included in the packet. He gave an example of other cities where the parking requirement for a multi-family two-bedroom unit ranges from one to 1.75. Staff suggests for a two-bedroom unit to have 1.75 spaces, and if it's affordable housing, 1.5 spaces. Embedded within the off-street parking table are two tiers of standards: market-rate apartments and affordable units. In addition to research, the suggestion is based on feedback from affordable housing developers in Central Oregon. Other changes speak to the requirements of House Bill 2001 regarding the amount of parking mandated for plexes and single-family homes.

D. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)

Redmond has had planned unit development standards which have been used very infrequently. Part of the last updates and looking at master plan standards, Staff wrote the new planned unit development, a tool they want to encourage because the intent is to allow for more creative design and lesser standards or flexibility in standards in-lieu for community benefits. Staff has learned from stakeholders there is misinformation out there about PUDs resulting in a reluctance in the development community to use them despite the desire to use them. The preconceived notions about a PUD are that it is more expensive than a subdivision, takes more time than a subdivision, and is required to go to the Planning Commission.

Staff believes they have addressed all three assumptions. A PUD is less than a subdivision. The amendments would not require it to go through a Planning Commission process unless it is over a certain size, the same sort of threshold as for a community meeting. The length of time for a PUD process is no longer than for a subdivision although it does require more thought.

The visuals showcased before the Commission on October 17th were all approved through a PUD.

E. Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Modification

Assistant City Engineer Lindsey Cromsigt presented the modifications on Chapter 8 for transportation impact analysis reviews. The two goals of the modifications are to consolidate the code because several sections were duplicated throughout and to change the review process for TIAs and trip generation reports associated with land use actions. Currently TIAs and trip generation reports are provided to the Planning Department when a land use application is submitted. Engineering first sees them after an application is deemed complete and it is in within the 120-day review period. Engineering is constrained within the timeframe to receive the traffic report from a transportation engineer which typically requires a couple rounds of review and some back-and-forth. Often Engineering is unable to get the full picture because time is limited but forced to make a decision.

Staff proposes to remove the transportation review from the planning land use application review process and move it to before the land use application is even deemed complete. Engineering would have its own application process for transportation impact reviews and after coming to concurrence on the report with transportation engineers would issue an approval memo with anticipated mitigations which basically would draft their conditions of approval ahead of time. It should streamline the land use application review process.

Commissioner Osmundson asked typically how much do TIAs cost for an applicant to start? She confirmed Engineering receives a percentage of each planning application fee which varies depending on what they are applying for, from a couple hundred to a couple thousand dollars. By pulling the process out of the planning application review, Staff would likely look at reducing the fee that Engineering receives with the planning fee because Engineering would charge their own fee ahead of time which has not been set. Currently they have a fee in the schedule that is \$813, likely to be modified with the fee update scheduled for December.

She confirmed in essence there would not be a change in the way the traffic impact study itself is done. It is just being resituated earlier in the land use process. Everything else will stay the same as far as doing the actual reporting.

She clarified Engineering is limited with time on some of the processes because typically if an application is submitted by a developer unfamiliar with traffic reviews, they require a trip generation report. If over 200 average daily trips or over 20 p.m. peak trips, a traffic impact analysis would be triggered which requires the developer to hire a professional engineer to do the field work. Engineering comments on the results provided by the developer and sometimes ask for more information which can go back and forth with the transportation engineer. The process can be very complicated. Sometimes the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) needs incorporated into the reviews, and ODOT has their own timelines. Sometimes Engineering is up against the timeclock and Engineering does not receive all the information they ask for.

One Commissioner did not understand with all the data available with ODOT, the City, the Comp Plan, why does it take so long, back and forth? Ms. Cromsigt confirmed the developers do look at the master plans and ODOT plans when they put the report together, but often the reports are 50 pages long plus appendices. They are very complicated. The report is completely site-dependent and more detailed than master plans, often involving someone on-site during morning and evening peak hours literally counting vehicles. Site-specific studies are required for each development.

Commissioner DeWolf asked how will they know prematurely if a project will generate such traffic to require a TIA? Will there be a time period for Public Works? If a developer is waiting for Engineering to do their part, does Engineering have a time period for the developer before the

120-day window starts with the application or are they proposing one? Ms. Crooms clarified Engineering is not proposing a time period. Knowing the traffic impacts on a preliminary level, Engineering requires the applicant to provide a conceptual site plan that would explain the different uses on the property. Engineering refers to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) federally adopted manual, a guide they use to define how many trips are generated by different uses which she described.

Commissioner DeWolf thought it felt premature because the developer may lose a lot of units before they get through planning to common space requirements, to parking requirements. If that is the case, would the developer have to get another report? Especially considering the fee, if they have to constantly update or change the reports, it seems very premature. She spoke to a couple local TIA guys who had strong concerns about the verbiage, and she felt Staff should reach out to those individuals and get their feedback before implementing a change. Ms. Crooms said they did talk with Kittelson who is their on-call transportation contract and were generally supportive of the process change.

Commissioner Osmundson asked would it make the application process shorter if the transportation analysis was done beforehand and how long is the TIA good for so the developer can make a decision? Ms. Crooms replied it would be treated as any other application, valid for 180 days, she believed. A lower impact change generally would not change Engineering's review, but something significant that added a lot of trips to the system and the TIA had not been completed, they would be concerned. But that situation would be no different whether during the land use application or before. Engineering does recognize there might be some changes before the decision is finalized.

Chair Jansen commented the idea was brand-new to the Commission and everyone and far more discussion is needed on the overall scope of how it affects Redmond's neighborhoods and developments. She thought the Commission should have more time to be more thoughtful and get more information from everybody before any changes in the code would happen. Other Commissioners agreed, especially since traffic is one of the first things to come up with a major subdivision, and wanted it studied more.

Mr. Roberts said Staff put a large investment and reliance on pre-development meetings. The better the information brought to pre-development, the better the results. What comes out of the pre-development and what is approved very rarely changes except maybe the edges a little bit, a unit here or there. With this amendment, Staff is trying to front-load the process to save time on the land use side. He explained how the 120-day timeline can result in a developer being at Day 35 or 40 before the project goes to Engineering. If something comes up requiring additional analysis, even if streamlined and everyone is on top of it, it is two weeks of back-and-forth. It can create a fire drill for applicant and Staff which is unfair.

Another Commissioner still wanted to study the matter further and asked if an applicant wants to develop a property that hardly sees traffic, do they still need to do a TIA? Ms. Crooms replied it depends on the development proposed. The Commissioner asked about a 20-acre development on the northwest side of town that hardly sees any traffic. She replied they will have to do a TIA if their proposed use will trigger 200 average daily trips or over 20 p.m. peak trips which are usually measured between 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. when people are going home from work.

In the analysis, Engineering usually looks at collector and arterial intersections nearby, access proposed to the site, and whether those are safe turning movements. If any intersection fails because the development is adding so many trips to the intersection, Engineering may require some other off-site mitigations. They do take into account the existing use and provide trip credits for that and look at the timeframe today, five years from now, and at the end of the development whenever anticipated.

Mr. Roberts emphasized the proposed change does not change the requirement or the standards of the requirement. It is only changing the timing to do the study. The unintended consequence of not implementing the change would be more denials due to inadequate time to review. Making the change enables more reasonable conditions to be evaluated and imposed. He added the City averages 260 to 280 land use applications a year, and he could see this coming up in two applications a year. Chair Jansen still thought the matter was worth more conversation and clarified she would like to see an explanation of the need to change the way it has always been done. Mr. Roberts replied the change is intended to create more certainty in the land use review process. Commissioner Schultz supported the change.

Commissioner DeWolf was concerned it is an open-ended window. When does it stop if it holds up an application at the development level due to various reasons. She is sure Staff checked with the City Attorney to see that it is legal to do prior to application. It seems like it's open-ended. Maybe there should be a time period. If she is reading it correctly, they cannot make application until the TIA is reviewed and addressed. Mr. Roberts confirmed they can make application after there is some acknowledgement matters are sufficiently addressed, adding the unintended consequence could be then it gets held up during the process resulting in a denial. In Commissioner DeWolf's opinion, the streamlining with the new pre-development requirement should work out a lot of bugs. Mr. Roberts clarified the pre-development requirement is not changing at all.

Ms. Cromsigt said at the pre-development meeting Staff looks at a very general site plan with very preliminary comments. The change to the TIA would be much more specific with a report given to Staff on the developer's proposed uses, access, and studies which is not required at the pre-development stage. In fact, a pre-development meeting is not always even required, although many people take advantage of them. They are not required for a land use application.

Commissioner DeWolf thought that was being prepared to be changed.

Commissioner Osmundson asked if the matter would be brought before City Council tomorrow. Ms. Cromsigt said yes

Mr. Roberts explained why the public hearing packet is 550 pages, noting a requirement of the statewide planning program is to acknowledge public facility plans as part of the Comp Plan which intends to ensure some level of service delivery with land use: efficient infrastructure coupled with good land use planning, to force such conversations. Redmond's Water Master Plan adopted in 2021 and the Wastewater Facility Plan adopted in 2018 and amended in 2020 have not been adopted into the Comp Plan 2040. Both plans are included in the packet to be adopted as supplemental and support plans as required to the Comp Plan 2040. The plans have been in place, are currently being implemented, and have been before Council multiple times.

[Proceeded to Item B]

F. Off-street Parking Requirements for Plexes

Mr. Kyle Roberts discussed design standards for single-family detached dwellings and plexes (Page 37 of the packet). Per House Bill 2001, more than one space per unit cannot be required for off-street parking for plexes. Subsection 6 about driveways and garages reads as if one is required to have a garage that needs to accommodate at least one parking space as well as the driveway. It almost seems like only two off-street spaces are required for a triplex when in fact three spaces are required. The garage standard is a requirement per structure, not unit. Redmond does require a garage for a triplex, and the garage just needs to be able to accommodate one parking space, one of the three.

Staff thought in order to make the standard read easier and be much more explicit with the off-street parking requirements, they added Subsection 7 which basically points the user to Section 8.0500 which is where one will find the number of off-street parking spaces.

G. Landscaping Standards for Single-family Detached Dwellings, Plexes, and Townhouses

Mr. Kyle Roberts discussed the landscaping standard for single-family and plexes (Page 39 of the packet). Current code points the user to a section that does not even exist. He thought the intent was to point the user to the landscaping standards under the site and design review article of the development code and the same for townhouse standards. The amendment would change it because the landscaping standards in the site and design article are not really suitable for single-family townhouses and plexes. They are meant more for multi-family complexes, industrial, commercial uses.

Rather than pointing the user to the section of code for site and design, Staff has taken a lot of the landscaping standards in place for single-family in Redmond's prior code and put them back in the code with a couple additions and revisions. He gave some examples including zero-scaping. The amendment also adds street tree requirements which exist in the code right now but are under the site and design review article.

V. NOVEMBER 21st DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

Mr. Kyle Roberts stated November 21st will be the first public hearing for the code amendments Staff has worked on for the last three months as well as the adoption of the Water Master Plan and Wastewater Facilities Plan. The packet includes a findings report for the code amendments as well as one for the Comp Plan amendment adding the public facilities plans.

Staff will do their best to incorporate tomorrow's feedback from Council and make any additional needed changes. Staff confirmed they are thinking December 5th for the next Planning Commission meeting.

VI. NEXT ROUND OF DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – JANUARY 2023

VII. COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Jansen reiterated the Planning Commissioners being at the City Council meeting does matter and helps the Commission prepare for their upcoming hearing to hear directly from City Council what they are looking and hoping for and what they want the Commission to bring to City Council for the Council's hearing.

Commissioner Osmundson thanked Staff and Ms. Crowsigt for coming and explaining the TIA matter and for all the hard work they have been doing on the code amendments.

VIII. ADJOURN

With no further business, Chair Jansen adjourned the meeting at 7:36 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