



CITY OF BEND

Minutes

Juniper Ridge Management Advisory Board

12:00 PM – 2:00 PM, Thursday, September 17, 2020

Meeting convened online via WebEx due to COVID-19 concerns

Staff Liaison: Matt Stuart

-
- **12:05 pm**
 - **Roll Call:** Katie Anderson (Chair), James Beauchemin, Craig Chenoweth, Corey Charon, Kristina Johnson, Levi McClain (Alternate)
 - **Public Comment**
No public comments.
 - **Approve**
 - August 27, 2020 Meeting Minutes approved.
 - **Review/Discussion/Action: Design Guidelines**
 - We had a preliminary discussion a couple of meetings ago. Simplify and highlight what is already in code. Looked at American Lane and Brinson which are IL. Have limited CCRs. Tried to simplify but leave intent. Did not bring up section of nuisance. Reduce to minimum standard where possible. Cleaned up text.
 - Introduction and Guiding Principles - changed the most. Katie thought it was clear. No other comments. Should boundaries change, it will automatically be updated. Katie thought might be good to use some graphics.

Guiding Principles. Jim asked about pedestrian, bicycle and transit components. Matt said we maintained 3 cross sections which ask for multi-modal environment. Left in code language choices. Defaults back to code. Hard to encourage internally within large sites. Larger lots may incorporate themselves. Levi – document is focusing on subdistrict only, correct? Will this be a baseline for future developers? Matt, no only per Bend Development Code or per Transportation System Plan. Through master planning process will have to address. Have to identify how each area connects to public ROW. Is per commercial master planning code. Do have multimodal in development code. Levi is okay with subdistrict only. Want to apply connectivity of east-west and north-south.

Organization of Design Guidelines, cleaned up and organized each section. Did not touch signage guidelines.

Review Process – CCRs already outline process. Do make reference to process to sections in code. Did clarify that the pre-app is City and they should arrange for a meeting or pre-app with design committee on their own.

Site Guidelines

Development Framework. Existing standards good enough. Focus on main collectors. Outer areas. Setbacks pushed back to standards on non main roads.

Preservation of Key Site Attributes – kept definition. Per BDC. Is a goal not a standard. Discussion regarding rock outcroppings and trees. Standards don't reference rock outcropping. In Guidelines request to preserve but if doesn't work can do as see fit especially if not along street frontages. Not a requirement. Levi feels rock outcroppings are an issue. Guidelines should not be to preserve rock but should be to promote development. Levi suggested making it metric driven instead of saying significant. On a specific size lot. Matt – standard IL it would still be a requirement to denote on a site plan. Not different what already exists in BDC. Katie if language is in code, should we highlight challenges and how to get through process. Matt – under standards of design guidelines, as suggested, you don't have to preserve but need to defend why it is not possible. Existing code does not qualify, just need to inventory. Doesn't inhibit development of site. Katie – word possible worries her. Especially if design review committee members change. Do we even want to make mention? We can revise language or remove totally. Discussion finally ended with the committee recommending to remove language regarding rock outcroppings in Guidelines.

Grading and Walls – Guidelines are an ask rather than a requirement. Aesthetic. Decision made to delete last point regarding walls in setbacks. Standards – BDC.

Drainage and storm water management. – Consistent with BDC and stormwater plan. Okay to leave because have to meet. Last guideline – promoting green and sustainable reflects goal statement.

Landscape of Public Streets – cleaned up and simplified. Kept in due to Cooley and 18th. Maintain consistency. Would apply to City. Otherwise reference to BDC.

On site Vehicular Circulation and Parking.
30' set back. Changed from required to encouraged. Could get rid of as

30' already applies to larger roads. Katie asked if don't even encourage, would it be an issue to those that already had to comply. Matt responded that hasn't really been applied. Katie – if more restrictive than BDC, should remove. Remove word “significantly” in “significantly shaded”. Get rid of reference to rock outcrops and trips.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation

Will be defined by street cross sections and will be per BDC. Could argue that could remove guidelines but other properties have. Leave in.

Plantings – no changes

Screening, Fencing and Utility Location – cleaned up quite a bit as has been challenging for development. Reduced requirements.

Guidelines, seen with existing development.

Levi asked what are we worried about. May not be practical where utilities place. Matt, believe is more directed to refuse location. Do we need to provide guidelines? Matt – others have done this so ask is to appease what already exists, to try to achieve more. Can't prevent it. Leave and move on.

Standards – BDC.

Exterior Lighting – no changes.

Part 2 - Architectural Guidelines

Building Mass and Bulk

Guidelines again asks.

Standards based on if along an arterial or collector street frontage (18th or Cooley, then are required to comply with commercial design standards.

Also applies to any zone that must meet commercial design standards. If not along a collector or arterial, then can reference back to industrial standards or commercial standards based on land use.

Trying to break up building form. Not so monolithic.

Façade Composition:

Guidelines on how to break up mass. Offered examples.

Context- Sensitive Design

Same as above

Sustainable Building Design - no changes

Relationship to the Public Realm.

Meet in middle between what code requires and design. Again offering up examples.

Roof Form –

Moved from requirements to suggestions – mechanical systems screening.

Materials and Colors

Guidelines had a lot listed that were discouraged.

Concern with more restrictions. Kristina suggested could get rid of as there are so many good materials for veneers. This is too specific. Maybe standard for quality of material. Intent was for durability. Agreed to remove wording.

Signage – unchanged did not add per standard.

Matt will go through document and make sure he didn't miss any tree or rock references.

All are good. Matt - Include in work plan letter. What we want Council to take action on. Agreed that Matt should move forward.

- **Review/Discussion/Action: JRMAB 12-Month Work Plan - Outline (Draft)**
 - Phase I – Near-term: Overlay Zone/Employment Subdistrict Interim Code Changes & Design Guidelines Revision
 - Katie talked about comprehensively over last couple of meetings.
 - Phase II – Mid-term: Subdivision Platting, Land Disposition Strategy & CC&Rs Amendments
 - Katie – We have reviewed platting and CCRs. What is happening with ECONorthwest? Is it possible to get additional information from them in a timely manner? Matt – they are putting together a scope for work. Hope to have for meeting in October. Evaluating the types of employees and doing projections. If not ready by October, then maybe a supplemental. Allow Chair and Vice Chair to discuss at meeting with Council if don't have before.
 - Phase III – Long-term Land Disposition Strategy & Infrastructure Coordination
 - See ECONorthwest comments above.
 - Any questions about layout of working plan. Next meeting will be about finalizing documents. Already given okay on

a lot of documents. Any other concerns.

Levi said he would review more thoroughly and get comments back if any. Likes where we landed today, making it more developer friendly.

Matt said to think of it as what you are telling Council to tell Matt/Staff to undertake in next 12 months. Go to website or go back to emails and let him know if anything is of concern. Katie – review feasibility documents before October meeting.

Jim – There are elements in Phase III we haven't discussed. References to complete communities, workforce housing, internal roads and planning around north interchange. Matt said he is trying to look ahead and get at what Council might task Matt in longer term and how/if JRMAB is tasked in future. Katie said we did talk about some of this in earlier meetings. For instance buffer zones. Also make sure sewer lines up with interior streets. Jim – doesn't want highlighted that we are pursuing without a good review. Katie said it is not documenting that we have done it. It is our recommendations based on what we have reviewed. Phase III is looking at what could possibly be next. Matt can change language if necessary.

- **Staff update**
 - North interchange - another advisory committee meeting last week. They are putting a workshop together.
 - North Corridor project still moving forward. ODOT looking at going out to bid later fall or early next year for Cooley portion.
 - North interceptor moving forward.

- **Adjourned at 1:47 pm.**