

MINUTES
UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting of Thursday, April 11, 2024, 6:30pm

** ****

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT: Suni Danforth, Chair, Sam Tucker, Emery Gentry, Ann Minton, Tami Green, Malcolm Millar, and Andrew Morris

COMMISSIONER

PRESENT VIA ZOOM: None

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: John Standley, and Kim Gillet

PLANNING STAFF:

Megan Davchevski, Planning Manager, Tierney Cimmityotti, Planner, Charlet Hotchkiss, Planner, and Shawwna Van Sickle, Administrative Assistant

** ** **** ****

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING. RECORDING IS AVAILABLE AT THE PLANNING OFFICE.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Danforth called the meeting to order at 6:31PM and read the Opening Statement.

MINUTES

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the minutes from the October 26, 2023 meeting. There were none. Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Minton seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the minutes from the November 9, 2023 meeting. There were none. Commissioner Gentry moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Minton seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

NEW HEARING

**CO-ADOPTION OF CITY OF HERMISTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP
AMENDMENT #P-136-24. HERMISTON HOME WORKS INC, APPLICANT/OWNER**

Chair Danforth called for any abstentions, bias, conflicts of interest, declarations of ex parte contact or objections to jurisdiction. No reports were made.

Chair Danforth called for the Staff Report.

STAFF REPORT

Megan Davchevski, Planning Manager, presented the Staff Report. Mrs. Davchevski started by introducing the Co-Adoption of the city of Hermiston plan map amendment to change the subject

property from urbanizable status to urban. On March 11, 2024, Hermiston City Council adopted Ordinance 2356, amending the Comprehensive Plan Map from “Urbanizable” to “Urban” for an 80-acre tract located on the south side of East Highland Ave. The City Council also adopted Ordinance 2357 annexing said property effective upon co-adoption of Ordinance 2356 by the County. She stated the City of Hermiston Joint Management Agreement (JMA) Section E (10) requires Comprehensive Plan Amendments applicable in the Urban Growth Area to be processed by the City. The JMA requires amendments to be adopted by ordinance, first by the City, then to the County for co-adoption review. She added the Hermiston City Council held a public hearing on March 11, 2024 and approved the plan map amendment and subsequently adopted Ordinance 2356 and 2357.

Mrs. Davchevski explained this hearing before the Umatilla County Planning Commission is the County’s first evidentiary hearing for co-adoption. A subsequent Public Hearing before the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners is scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2024, at 9:00 AM in Room 130 of the Umatilla County Courthouse, 216 SE 4th Street, Pendleton, OR 97801. She concluded by stating the Umatilla County Planning Commission has an obligation to make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for co-adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, changing the designation of the property from “Urbanizable” to “Urban”.

Chair Danforth asked if any commissioners had questions for Staff. Chair Danforth stated she had questions regarding the map attached with the designation of zoning. She explained she had to guess designations due to missing information. She stated she believed designations “L” as low-density, “M” as medium density, and two “C’s” were commercial. Mrs. Davchevski confirmed and stated the map represented is a city map. Chair Danforth agreed with Mrs. Davchevski and explained further how she’d like some clarification from the applicant regarding those specific designations.

Chair Danforth asked about the description on page six. She mentioned the application depicts an area of over 80 acres. The description lists 33.64 acres and nothing else. She asked if there was a missing page, as it also mentions a section included from East Highland, directly north of said tract and no acreage was noted. Mrs. Davchevski stated this was a legal description of the property as it was adopted in the City of Hermiston ordinance. She confirmed she would check with City of Hermiston to ensure the legal descriptions are complete before the application goes before the Board of County Commissioners.

Chair Danforth referenced Exhibit A – Findings of Fact under policies 4, on page 9 sub-item thirteen explaining the property is not high-value farmland and it has predominantly in hay. She further explained the picture on page 3 shows the property has been irrigated and has a half crop circle. Mrs. Davchevski stated the property is located within the city’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and has RF2 designation, which is a farm designation from the 1972 Development Code. She explained the property may qualify for farm deferral on their taxes, but it’s not considered Goal 3 agricultural lands because it is within the UGB.

Commissioner Morris stated he had a question regarding traffic mitigation from page 9, under Policies 4 (Orderly Urban Growth), 5 (Annexation) and 6 (Conversion) noting number fifteen and sixteen. He asked about Goal 10 on page 11, number thirty-one for population growth, speaking about the future population growth and future housing units. How traffic would impact Highway 395 with already heavy traffic present. Chair Danforth stated this was not a matter before the Planning Commission that evening. Mrs. Davchevski answered his questions regarding page 13, under Goal 12 – Transportation. The city found that the applicant did a Traffic Impact Analysis and they were compliant with the requirements. Mrs. Davchevski stated the applicant may be able to address traffic more, but typically Comprehensive Plan Amendments don't deal with that. She explained development comes much later and usually goes before City Planning, not the County Planning Commission.

Chair Danforth asked if there were any further questions for staff. No further questions were stated. Chair Danforth called for the Proponent testimony.

Applicant Testimony: Mr. Tyler Brandt, 469 SW Cottonwood Dr, Hermiston, OR 97838; Mr. Brandt stated he owns the company Hermiston Homeworks INC. He started by answering some questions regarding the legal description. He mentioned 33 acres was likely regarding the R2 portion only. He stated they were required to do a separate legal description for each zone they were applying for. Chair Danforth confirmed stating the packet reflected the 33-acre zone as currently Future Industrial amended to R2 designation.

Mr. Brandt explained of the roughly 80-acre parcel, approximately 31 acres would be split into Commercial or C2, and then 33 acres of Residential, R2, and the remaining acreage would be Residential, R3. He stated he thinks 30-31% of the acreage would be R3. Chair Danforth agreed and mentioned page 9, subsection twelve stated the breakdown in the packet. She expressed concerns regarding the missing information for the other legal descriptions. Mr. Brandt agreed it was curious that only one description was listed, when there should be several in the application. Mrs. Davchevski stated this could have been missing from the copy sent to the Planning Departments' office but ensured she would confirm the full packet would be sent to the Board of Commissioners for further co-adoption consideration.

Chair Danforth and Commissioner Millar conversed about the total acreage. Chair Danforth stated 5.9 acres and 29.67 acres totals the commercial acreage listed as 33.64 acres. Mr. Brandt stated he believed this project fits Hermiston's housing needs and conforms to all the different codes and laws. He expressed he has worked diligently with engineers, surveyors, City and County staff to get the right information gathered to do this correctly. He stated the build out will be a slow process. The first phase, designed with his engineer, would put 28 lots built over a two-year period. The site plan shows approximately 209 lots, he believes this project will span at least 10-years.

Mr. Brandt added they don't have exact plans for the commercial lots yet. He stated he spoke with city staff, before indicating interest in purchasing this property, about what they thought

could be seen in this area including south of the train tracks and the airport. He expressed if years later the demand for commercial need is not there, then it would be possible to convert this section to more R1 designation. The same would be said for the 5.9-acre piece in the main part of the property. He expressed he believes city staff envision it as a natural extension of the government and educational building to the west, but no plans are official at this time for the area.

Mr. Brandt stated a traffic impact analysis was completed to assume the worst-case scenario for C2, so their options were open in case interest was shown for the area. He expressed plans for the residential properties would be single-family housing and some duplexes. He added the cost is rising in the Hermiston housing market and believes this annexation would help address some of these issues. He concluded that changing the land use designation to something more appropriate now, then it was forty to fifty years ago from industrial is necessary.

Chair Danforth asked if Commissioners had any additional questions. Commissioner Millar asked if he would be the only contractor developing on the property. Mr. Brandt stated he owns the property and would likely build most homes on the property but would be open to selling lots to other builders that want to build there. He reiterated that his plan is to build ten homes next year and see how things progress in the future.

Neutral: None

Opponents: None

Public Agencies: None

Chair Danforth asked if Mr. Brandt wanted to return for any rebuttal. Mr. Brandt declined.

Applicant Rebuttal: None

Chair Danforth closed the hearing for deliberation.

DELIBERATION & DECISION

Chair Danforth stated there were no new exhibits. She stated she thought this was a pretty straightforward application. Commissioner Tucker asked if any specific language was needed for the motion. Mrs. Davchevski stated they would need to state they would recommend approval or denial with the application.

Commissioner Tucker made a new motion to recommend approval of the Co-Adoption of the City of Hermiston Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment #P-136-24 to the Board of Commissioners.

Commissioner Green seconded the motion. Motion carried with a vote of 7:0 recommending approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

NEW HEARING

TYPE I LAND DIVISION (SUB-DIVISION) #S-063-24: ABRAHAM & MAGGIE RODRIGUEZ, APPLICANTS/OWNERS

Chair Danforth called for any abstentions, bias, conflicts of interest, declarations of ex parte contact or objections to jurisdiction. No reports were made.

Chair Danforth called for the Staff Report.

STAFF REPORT

Ms. Charlet Hotchkiss began by introducing herself and stated the second request tonight is for establishment of a proposed rural residential subdivision with eight lots. According to the applicant, each undeveloped lot will have its' own water source either from an individual domestic well or through a shared domestic well. Individual septic systems are proposed for each lot. The applicant has not indicated if Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) will be recorded.

Ms. Hotchkiss stated the property is located north of Punkin Center Road on the southeast corner of Joy Lane and Alpine Drive, about a half mile north of Hermiston city limits. She mentioned the Standards of Approval are found in the Umatilla County Development Code (UCDC) Section 152.665, Type I Land Divisions. Standards for reviewing a subdivision generally consist of complying with UCDC standards, Traffic Impact Analysis standards and subdivision plat requirements.

Ms. Hotchkiss further added that staff had identified one standard that the Planning Commission may find is not satisfied: buildable space. The applicant's tentative plan demonstrates that the proposed Lot 2 (which is 3.43 acres) will have only 18% (0.55 acres) buildable space inside the 20-foot setback requirements, which the Planning Commission may find does not satisfy UCDC 152.648(16)(a)(1). She stated this is because proposed Lot 2 is severely impacted by existing easements; therefore, development on this lot will be extremely limited. This is due to the 250-foot-wide BPA (Bonneville Power Administration) easement that covers a majority of the lot that cannot be built within. Additionally, there is a 75-foot-wide natural gas line easement that stretches across the northern side of the lot, this easement is also not buildable.

Ms. Hotchkiss was called on April 4, 2024 by a representative from Williams NW Pipeline to ensure Planning Staff and Applicants were aware of the existing gas line easements on proposed Lots 1, 2 and 3. I assured him that both Planning Staff and Applicants were aware of the gas line easements and were included in the staff report. She added that while proposed Lots 1 and 3 also have a portion of the existing gas line easement on the property it is a much smaller portion than the gas line easement on proposed Lot 2, and the future owners of proposed Lots 1 and 3 will have adequate building space. Due to the BPA easement and gas line easement on proposed Lot

2 there is not much acreage left for amenities that are desirable on rural lots, such as; a large dwelling, barn and shop structures.

Ms. Hotchkiss referred to page 6 of the packet, where a map showed the buildable space of proposed Lot 2 and how it is significantly less than the other lots within the proposed subdivision. The UCDC Section 152.134 Dimensional Standards(C)(1) allows for a maximum of 30% building coverage on a lot zoned RR-2. The current subdivision layout would not allow the future owner of Lot 2 to build structures that would cover 30% of the total lot area.

Ms. Hotchkiss stated Planning Staff communicated with the applicant, on multiple occasions both in person and by email, with concerns over the lack of buildable space on Lot 2. Suggestions of combining proposed Lot 2 with Lot 1 or Lot 3 were made but ultimately the applicant made no changes to their preliminary plat. She stated the applicant's proposal for a 3.43-acre lot with only 0.55 acres of buildable space creates the potential for future landowners to request a variance to the RR-2 zone's building setback requirements. Ms. Hotchkiss stated UCDC Section 152.627 Circumstances for Granting a Variance (A) states "Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and result from size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of the property since enactment of this have had no control."

Ms. Hotchkiss stated the Umatilla County Planning Division finds a variance to the zone's setback requirements for Proposed Lot 2 could likely not be approved. Since the circumstance that created the need for the variance was created post the enactment of UCDC 152.627, knowingly by the current property owner. Additionally, newly created lots should meet development standards as nonconforming lots cannot be created.

Ms. Hotchkiss explained the Planning Commission may find that the proposed subdivision will make compliance with setbacks difficult for structures typical in a residential zone such as a dwelling, shop building and animal barn. Therefore, the Planning Commission may find that the proposed subdivision must be reconfigured to create more buildable space so that lots are not created which require variances to setback requirements.

Ms. Hotchkiss added alternatively, the Planning Commission may make new findings and approve the tentative plan as presented. These standards are addressed in the preliminary findings and conclusions. However, you may notice that there are several "Planning Commission may find" statements. She stated the Planning Commission may agree or disagree with some or all of these statements based on facts and evidence in the record.

Ms. Hotchkiss stated notice of the applicant's request and the public hearing was mailed on March 22, 2024 to the owners of properties located within 250-feet of the perimeter of Tax Lot 200. Notice was also published in the East Oregonian on March 30, 2024 notifying the public of the applicant's request before the Planning Commission on April 11, 2024.

Ms. Hotchkiss added that a comment was received from Hermiston Irrigation District (HID) on March 25, 2024 and was included in the hearing packets. Staff also received an additional comment from Hermiston Irrigation District on April 10, 2024 stating that HID would prefer the developer pipe the stretch of ditch they are building on, but it is a large expense and not mandatory. However, HID will require that the easement is fenced off on both sides of the ditch easement. HID included their Easement Policy that details their fencing policy. HID also indicated there will be a Development Agreement and Building Permit Agreement that the developer will be required to sign and abide by. She stated this emailed comment will need to be entered into the record as Exhibit A.

Ms. Hotchkiss further explained the proposed Conditions of Approval address road improvement and access standards, including road naming and Irrevocable Consent Agreements, site suitability for septic systems, and the survey and recording requirements with final approval accomplished through the recording of the final subdivision plat. The decision made by the Planning Commission is final unless timely appealed to the County Board of Commissioners.

Ms. Hotchkiss ended by stating this concluded the staff report unless there are any questions.

Commissioner Tucker asked if given the option of approving the application or could they set conditions on the approval, perhaps a covenant not to sell separately, requiring the applicant to sell Lot 1 and Lot 2 together or Lot 2 and Lot 3 together. Mrs. Davchevski stated she believed the cleaner way would be to approve with the condition of combining Lot 2 with either Lot 1 or Lot 3. Commissioner Tucker agreed and asked if that would require a covenant not to sell separately. Mrs. Davchevski stated it would simply be reconfiguring the subdivision, so the applicant would not have to appear before the Planning Commissioner again.

Chair Danforth stated Lot 6 looks to cross an irrigation ditch and asked how much land existed on the north side of the irrigation canal because it appears landlocked. Ms. Hotchkiss stated the total size Lot 6 is 2.26 acres, including the area north of the irrigation canal. Chair Danforth stated, per Exhibit A, the irrigation district prefers that lot lines meet at the center of the irrigation canals. Which Ms. Hotchkiss reiterated was again stated in their comment. Mrs. Davchevski mentioned she calculated the area north of the canal as approximately .7 acres and this would be non-usable unless the owner or applicant paid to have this area of irrigation piped inground.

Applicant Testimony: Mrs. Maggie Rodriguez, 405 N 1st Street, Unit 101, Hermiston, OR 97838; Mrs. Rodriguez began by stating their application was to subdivide their nineteen-acre parcel into eight 2-acre parcels. She felt this property would be a great area to develop since it has remained vacant for a long time. She stated she envisions this as an area for stick-built homes. She stated residents moving out of the city limits aren't generally looking for water rights and a lot of acreage, they are looking to build a home, space to ride off-road vehicles, build shops or garages and have some buffer between neighbors, per her expertise as a real estate agent.

Mrs. Rodriguez stated she could not find anything within the development code that mentioned minimum buildable size required. She explained Lot 2 would only have .55 acres of buildable space but referenced several recent sales in 2022, where homes with shops and/or garages were built on properties with similar sized lots. She specifically mentioned a property with .61-acre buildable space on a 2-acre parcel, that had easements from BPA (Bonneville Power Administration), natural gas, or an irrigation easement. This property didn't have a large shop, but they did build a 4,200 square-foot home.

Commissioner Tucker asked if giving examples of similar sized properties is a precedent for justifying the usage in size for the two-acre minimum. He stated there may be a lot of properties that were built and meet that requirement but that doesn't mean that they are all usable. Mrs. Rodriguez stated no, she does believe it is important to maintain the two-acre. She reiterated Lot 2 has 3.43 acres of total space, only .55 acres can be built upon, and if new owners want more space to build additional accessory structures than they will need to seek a variance.

Mrs. Rodriguez stated .55 acres is around 24,000 square feet. She mentioned in the past 36 months, there have been 129 home sales ranging between one to seven acres. The median size of those homes was approximately 1,800 square feet. She went into further detail about size of homes and describing how much space would be left over in buildable space after a home was built on a small property, like Lot 2. Commissioner Tucker summarized what the applicant had stated and mentioned as opposed to heeding the advice staff offered about changing the lot size the applicant wants to give more examples locally where people have built on less space. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she didn't understand it that way. She reiterated her interpretation from what staff suggested was that amenities that might be more desirable in such a space.

Commissioner Tucker asked the applicant if the choice was given to her between denying this application or requiring you to either not sell Lot 2 without including Lot 1 or Lot 3, would she prefer the Planning Commission to deny the application. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she would like that they don't deny it but keep it as it was submitted. Commissioner Tucker spoke in length about the applicants request to keep it as is, and then a possibility of a future homeowner inquiring years in the future requesting a variance. A variance would only be allowed in extraordinary circumstances. He stated the applicant has the ability to change this property to prevent any issues for the future property owners. Mrs. Rodriguez asked how often variances are requested, she stated as a real estate agent she is obligated to tell prospective home buyers the restrictions of the property and would personally inform them because she feels like the issues are obvious for this lot and hard to miss.

Commissioner Millar questioned the buildable space on the map. Chair Danforth and Mrs. Davchevski were able to address his question and state where on the map it showed buildable space. Commissioner Morris asked if Mrs. Rodriguez would disclose the usable versus buildable space in her listing. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she would because she has to disclose those items and dishonesty affects her business.

Chair Danforth asked about Lot 6 as discussed earlier, and how she would market the area to the north that is landlocked. Mrs. Rodriguez stated that area would be less desirable due to it being landlocked and non-usable, but reassured Chair Danforth that if someone wanted water rights it would be very easy since the canal is right there. Chair Danforth asked if the property line was moved to the center of the irrigation canal the lot would not meet the minimum criteria of 2-acres. She also asked about Quail Road and the responsibilities for maintenance, who would bear the financial cost of maintaining that road. Mrs. Rodriguez stated it was currently a private drive and was uncertain of the cost to maintain the roads but thought the property owners nearby would bear that expense. Chair Danforth stated she was asking because this was an issue that comes up many times before. She mentioned CC&Rs would help determine this. Chair Danforth asked if there was any maintenance done on the existing Quail Ave/Drive. Mrs. Rodriguez stated there was almost no maintenance or use on the other road. She mentioned it would be set as a dead-end road to a through road, so she didn't expect there to be an increase in traffic.

Chair Danforth asked if there was any thought put into the road questions. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she plans to have CCRs in place to help mitigate those issues and questions, specifically, to control what type of homes can be built there and restricting the placement of mobile/manufactured homes and only allowing stick-built homes.

Commissioner Millar asked if any conversation occurred with Hermiston Irrigation and whether the area can be piped for ease of development and maintaining the land. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she initially did contact HID and was told no issue existed. It wasn't until perhaps after they received the notice/map and responded with comment two days ago with the request to have the canal piped instead. She stated she felt like that would be very expensive. Commissioner Tucker asked who will pay for the cost to fence or pipe those areas. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she would expect the Planning Commission would ask her as property owner to pay for that it. Commissioner Millar asked if the irrigation canal is currently fenced. Mrs. Rodriguez stated it is not, but a road for access to the canal is all that remains at this time. Commissioner Tucker stated that if a fence were required it would likely mean the landowner would have no access to that area on the other side of the lot to do any maintenance of the land.

Chair Danforth stated the applicant did not take the proposal back to the drawing board after receiving the first recommendation by staff regarding Lot 1 and now Lot 6.

Opponents: None

Public Agencies: Hermiston Irrigation District, Annette Kirkpatrick, 366 E Hurlburt Ave, Hermiston, OR 97838; Ms. Annette Kirkpatrick introduced herself as the District Manager at Hermiston Irrigation District (HID). She stated HID is a Bureau of Reclamation project and that includes federal easements which run from the center line of the ditch, in this case is runs 30-feet from the center north and south. She mentioned HID has a fencing policy which applies to subdivision and land divisions, that requires a 6-foot chain link fence on both sides of the canal to prevent encroachment and protect the federal easements in place. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated the

Bureau of Reclamation requires a 60-foot easement to allow for movement along the irrigation canal with equipment for repairs, etc. She added HID tries their best to work with developers to allow for access as much as possible and added if a gate needs to be added to Lot 6 to allow access to the north side of the canal that could be accommodated. Additionally, the owners could apply for a crossing agreement in order to place a bridge.

Ms. Kirkpatrick also stated many fees exist (ranging from developer fees, to agreements). She mentioned piping can be very expensive but by doing so, odors from agriculture piles/byproducts can be mitigated. Commissioner Millar asked which size of pipe would be needed and if HID would allow piping only done across a single lot. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated they would likely ask for it to be done across the entire development, not individual lots and they would need a 30-inch pipe. Commissioner Millar and Commissioner Gentry asked if piping existed nearby this development and if it would allow them to use the area on the north side of the irrigation canal on Lot 6. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated they would no longer be required to fence along the canal since it would be piped. Ms. Kirkpatrick confirmed it could be an open field.

Chair Danforth asked if HID prefers lot lines go to the middle of the canal, and referred to Lot 5, which does not according to the current map. Ms. Kirkpatrick stated it was not mandatory, but customary with new developments.

Applicant Rebuttal: Mrs. Maggie Rodriguez, 405 N 1st Street, Unit 101, Hermiston, OR 97838; Mrs. Rodriguez stated she feels like adding a bridge would be more feasible than piping would. Chair Danforth stated she heard differently, and that option would be more expensive. Mrs. Rodriguez stated she feels like she would be open to moving the property line for Lot 5 to the center of the canal. She didn't have more to add.

Chair Danforth closed the hearing for deliberation.

Chair Danforth adopted the following exhibits into the record:

Exhibit A; April 10, 2024, Agency comment from Hermiston Irrigation District submitted by Annette Kirkpatrick, District Manager

Exhibit B; April 11, 2024, Agency comment from Bonneville Power Administration submitted by Deborah Rodgers, Realty Technician Contractor

DELIBERATION & DECISION

Chair Danforth stated she enjoys the additions of subdivisions but feels like there are too many issues with this proposal and this application needs to go back to the drawing board. She stated the large number of easements and lack of buildable space on Lot 2 would truly affect the new property owner. Commissioner Minton stated she felt the same especially if/when second or third generation owners come seeking variances due to decisions made in the past that could have

been prevented. Commissioner Tucker agreed with both Commissioner Minton and Chair Danforth and stated he believed Lot 2 should be combined with Lot 1 or Lot 3. He reiterated that Lot 6 also was a problem due to the space north of the irrigation canal that is unreachable to the future owner.

Commissioner Minton stated she felt the triangular section above the irrigation canal on Lot 6 creates too many potential issues with lack of access. Commissioner Green stated she felt the access road presented some issues as well, especially with understanding the financial responsibilities. Commissioner Tucker agreed that too much changing of language to approve this would be unnecessary and believed asking the applicant to start over would be better suited. Commissioner Gentry agreed and stated it was up to the applicant to find a workable solution.

Commissioner Gentry made a new motion to deny of the application due to the smaller buildable space on Lot 2 that needs addressed. The area above Lot 6 that is land locked on the north side of the canal along with addressing road access and maintenance costs, with CC&Rs. Additionally, asking that property lines are moved to the center of the irrigation canal, following the recommendation of the irrigation district based on their federal easements.

Commissioner Morris seconded the motion. Motion carried with a unanimous vote of 7 to 0 for denial.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Danforth stated the need to vote for Chair and Vice Chair for the Planning Commission. Commissioner Tucker nominated existing Chair, Commissioner Danforth, to continue as the acting Chair of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Tucker made a new motion to elect Commissioner Suni Danforth as Umatilla County Planning Commission Chair.

Commissioner Gentry seconded the motion. Motion carried with a vote of 7 to 0 to approve.

Commissioner Danforth made a new motion to elect Commissioner Sam Tucker as Umatilla County Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Commissioner Millar seconded the motion. Motion carried with a vote of 7 to 0 to approve.

Mrs. Davchevski welcomed our two new Planning Commissioner's Andrew Morris and Malcolm Millar. She also mentioned we have another Planning Commission occurring on April 25, 2024 to address two legislative items, one regarding animal density standards, specifically the noise caused by roosters and complaints received over the past several years. The other matter deals with digitizing the Zoning Maps. She stated we no longer have the ability to update them due to changes in software and this allows them to become more accessible to our staff and the public. Ms. Hotchkiss stated packets would be going out that week and to direct any

questions to the Community Development office or to the website where more information was available about the proposed changes. Commissioner Tucker asked if any contact would be considered ex parte contact. Mrs. Davchevski stated if the public wanted to provide comments, to direct them to our office.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Danforth adjourned the meeting at 8:13PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawna Van Sickle,

Administrative Assistant

Minutes adopted by the Planning Commission on September 26, 2024