

HERMISTON PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

September 12, 2018

Chairman Saylor called the meeting to order at 7:00PM. Commissioners Frederic, Doherty, Hamm, Sargent, Caplinger and Fialka were present. Commissioners Erz and Rebman were excused. Staff in attendance were City Planner Clinton Spencer and Heather La Beau.

Minutes

Minutes of the July 11, 2018 planning commission meeting were approved. Commissioner Fialka abstained.

Hearing- Zoning Text Amendment- Florist Shop

Chairman Saylor asked if any commissioner had a conflict of interest. Commissioner Rebman declared a conflict and remained in the audience. The hearing was opened at 7:02PM and the following guidelines were read:

The planning commission is holding a hearing to consider amending the Hermiston Code of Ordinances section 157.026 (B)(5) to add florist shop as a permitted conditional use in the Duplex Residential (R-2) Zone. The applicant is Shera Hopper.

The applicable substantive criteria relied upon by the City in rendering the decision to amend the zoning text are contained in §157.226 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.

Testimony and evidence must be directed toward the criteria described above or other criteria in the comprehensive plan or land use regulations that the person believes to apply to the decision.

Failure to raise an issue by the close of the record at or following the hearing, in person or by letter, precludes appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) or the city council based on that issue.

Failure to provide statements or evidence sufficient to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to that issue precludes appeal to LUBA or the city council based on that issue.

For this hearing, the process begins with the staff report, followed by testimony from the applicants and any other supporters of the application. This will be followed by opponents to the application. Finally, a rebuttal by the applicant will be allowed. The public hearing portion of the procedure will then be closed, and the planning commission will consider the information and testimony received and make a recommendation for approval or denial to the city council.

City Planner Spencer presented the staff report. The planning commission needs to determine if the proposed amendment passes will a new conditional use permit application be required by the applicant.

Testimony

Shera Hopper, 611 E Highland Ave- Ms. Hopper provided a brief history of how she came to lease the property from the Lowrance's. She did not realize that there was an issue with the use of the property as a florist shop. She believes it's a benefit to the community.

Tami Rebman, 1320 SW 6th St- Ms. Rebman stated this was the third time she has testified relating to this property. The first two times she was opposed to the beauty salon that was proposed. Her concerns proved to be non-issues. The traffic flows and homes continue to sell. She feels it is reasonable to add florist shop to the list.

Commissioner Rebman exited the meeting at 7:23.

City Planner Spencer stated that having small retail operations mixed in with houses helps to build walkable mixed use neighborhoods.

Chairman Saylor closed the hearing at 7:25PM.

Findings of Fact

Goal 1 and Policy 1. Citizen Involvement. The City will insure that citizens have an adequate opportunity to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

1. Notice of public hearings were published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days prior to the planning commission hearing on August 22, 2018 and 20 days prior to the city council hearing on September 5, 2018 in accordance with §157.226 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
2. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 12, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F).
3. The City Council held a public hearing on September 24, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F)

Goal 1 and Policy 2. Planning Process. The City of Hermiston will monitor and update periodically its comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances to respond to changing conditions.

4. Policy 2 requires the City to annually review development activity and its impacts.
5. The planning commission reviewed the proposed inclusion of florist shop to the permitted conditional uses and determined it was reasonably similar to the other conditional uses permitted in the R-2 zone.

Goal 2 and Policy 3. Intergovernmental Coordination. The City of Hermiston will facilitate intergovernmental coordination so that decisions affecting local, state, and federal planning and development actions in the Hermiston area are rendered in an efficient and consistent manner.

6. The notice of proposed amendment was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing in accord with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660, Division 18.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands, Goal 4 Forest Lands, Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway, Goal 16 Estuarine Resources, Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands, Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes, Goal 19 Ocean Resources.

7. There are no tracts of lands subject to Goals 3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, or 19 anywhere within the city limits or UGB. These goals are not applicable.

Goal 5 Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Space, Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resource Quality, Goal 7 Areas Subject to Natural Hazards, Goal 8 Recreation Needs, Goal 9 Economic Development, Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services, Goal 13 Energy Conservation, Goal 14 Urbanization.

8. The City's acknowledged comprehensive plan has policies established for compliance with Goals 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 14. The proposed amendment expands the allowed conditional uses with a use that is materially similar to the existing allowed uses. No additional findings must be made demonstrating compliance with these Goals.

Goal 9 Economic Development

9. Goal 9 requires the city to provide adequate sites for a variety of commercial and industrial uses and to limit commercial and industrial sites where they are located near residential uses. The proposed inclusion of a florist shop as a conditional use will provide an additional business opportunity which is low impact in terms of noise and trip generation near residential uses.

Goal 10 Housing

10. Goal 10 requires the city to accommodate all forms of needed housing units. Broadening the allowed uses allows the city to provide neighborhood services within walking distance of residential development.

Goal 12 Transportation and OAR 660, Division 012

11. The proposed amendment allows a new use which generates trips which are equivalent to the existing allowed uses. Therefore no new trips will be created and no transportation facility will be significantly affected as a result of the amendment.

Hermiston Zoning Ordinance §157.226

12. The proposed amendment was requested from a private citizen in compliance with §157.226(A).
13. The proposed amendment amends the text of the zoning ordinance, has a widespread impact on the city as a whole, and does not involve an amendment to the zoning map. Therefore, the proposed amendment is a legislative amendment as defined by §157.226(B)(1) and §157.226(C)(1) and (2).
14. Based upon Finding #13, the proposed amendment is not a quasi-judicial action and the approval criteria in §157.226(E)(1) are not applicable.
15. Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days in advance of the first evidentiary hearing as required by §157.226(F) and modified by ORS 197.610.

16. A notice of public hearing for the planning commission hearing was published on August 22, 2018 and the city council notice was published on September 5, 2018. Each notice was published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days in advance of the hearing as required by §157.229(D).
17. Based upon Finding #13, the proposed amendment is legislative and mailed notice to property owners is not required per §157.229(D).

Commissioner Caplinger moved and Commissioner Fialka seconded to approve the findings of fact as written. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Doherty moved and Commissioner Hamm seconded to recommend approval of including florist shop as a conditional use in an R-2 zone. Motion passed unanimously.

After discussion that included neighboring property owners' right to notice, cost burden on the applicant, and precedent setting, Commissioner Hamm moved to accept the applicant's use as grandfathered in and not require a new application. There was no second.

Commissioner Doherty moved and Commissioner Frederic seconded to require the florist shop owner to complete a conditional use application if the proposed amendment is approved. Roll Call. Motion passed 4 -3.

Hearing-Zoning Amendment Open Space requirement for Nursery Schools

Chairman Saylor asked if any commissioner had a conflict of interest. Seeing none, the hearing was opened at 7:44PM.

The planning commission is holding a hearing to consider amending the Hermiston Code of Ordinances section 157.210 to align with Oregon Administrative Rules for provision of open space at nursery schools. There was no objection to waiving the reading of the hearing guidelines.

City Planner Spencer presented the staff report.

There was no public testimony and Chairman Saylor closed the hearing at 7:46PM.

Findings of Fact

Goal 1 and Policy 1. Citizen Involvement. The City will insure that citizens have an adequate opportunity to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

1. Notice of public hearings were published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days prior to the planning commission hearing on August 22, 2018 and 20 days prior to the city council hearing on September 5, 2018 in accordance with §157.226 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
2. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 12, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F).
3. The City Council held a public hearing on September 24, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F)

Goal 1 and Policy 2. Planning Process. The City of Hermiston will monitor and update periodically its comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances to respond to changing conditions.

4. Policy 2 requires the City to annually review development activity and its impacts.
5. The planning commission reviewed the amendment and determined the city code should be amended to reflect state requirements for nursery schools which are regularly reviewed by education professionals.

Goal 2 and Policy 3. Intergovernmental Coordination. The City of Hermiston will facilitate intergovernmental coordination so that decisions affecting local, state, and federal planning and development actions in the Hermiston area are rendered in an efficient and consistent manner.

6. The notice of proposed amendment was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing in accord with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660, Division 18.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands, Goal 4 Forest Lands, Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway, Goal 16 Estuarine Resources, Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands, Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes, Goal 19 Ocean Resources.

7. There are no tracts of lands subject to Goals 3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, or 19 anywhere within the city limits or UGB. These goals are not applicable.

Goal 5 Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Space, Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resource Quality, Goal 7 Areas Subject to Natural Hazards, Goal 8 Recreation Needs, Goal 9 Economic Development, Goal 10 Housing, Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services, Goal 13 Energy Conservation, Goal 14 Urbanization.

8. The proposed amendment affects development of educational facilities. No impact is made on allowed uses or land supply.

Goal 12 Transportation and OAR 660, Division 012

9. The proposed amendment does not affect trip generation in any way as no new uses are proposed. Therefore, no new trips will be created and no transportation facility will be significantly affected as a result of the amendment.

Hermiston Zoning Ordinance §157.226

10. The proposed amendment was initiated by the city council on August 13, 2018 in compliance with §157.226(A).
11. The proposed amendment amends the text of the zoning ordinance, has a widespread impact on the city as a whole, and does not involve an amendment to the zoning map. Therefore, the proposed amendment is a legislative amendment as defined by §157.226(B)(1) and §157.226(C)(1) and (2).

12. Based upon Finding #11, the proposed amendment is not a quasi-judicial action and the approval criteria in §157.226(E)(1) are not applicable.
13. Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days in advance of the first evidentiary hearing as required by §157.226(F) and modified by ORS 197.610.
14. A notice of public hearing for the planning commission hearing was published on August 22, 2018 and the city council notice was published on September 5, 2018. Each notice was published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days in advance of the hearing as required by §157.229(D).
15. Based upon Finding #11, the proposed amendment is legislative and mailed notice to property owners is not required per §157.229(D).

Commissioner Fialka moved and Commissioner Hamm seconded to approve the findings of fact as written. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Caplinger moved and Commissioner Fialka seconded to recommend the City Council approve amending the Hermiston Code of Ordinances section 157.210 to align with Oregon Administrative Rules for provision of open space at nursery schools. Motion passed unanimously.

Hearing- Zoning Amendment Notice for appeals of land use decisions

Chairman Saylor asked if any commissioner had a conflict of interest. Seeing none, the hearing was opened at 7:47PM.

The planning commission is holding a hearing to consider amending the Hermiston Code of Ordinances section 157.231 to match Oregon statutory requirements for appeals of land use decisions. There was no objection to waiving the reading of hearing guidelines.

City Planner Spencer presented the staff report.

There was no public testimony and Chairman Saylor closed the hearing at 7:50PM.

Findings of Fact

Goal 1 and Policy 1. Citizen Involvement. The City will insure that citizens have an adequate opportunity to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

1. Notice of public hearings were published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days prior to the planning commission hearing on August 22, 2018 and 20 days prior to the city council hearing on September 5, 2018 in accordance with §157.226 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
2. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 12, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F).
3. The City Council held a public hearing on September 24, 2018 in accordance with §157.226(F).

Goal 1 and Policy 2. Planning Process. The City of Hermiston will monitor and update periodically its comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances to respond to changing conditions.

4. Policy 2 requires the City to annually review development activity and its impacts.
5. The planning commission reviewed the amendment and determined the city code should be amended to reflect current state statutes.

Goal 2 and Policy 3. Intergovernmental Coordination. The City of Hermiston will facilitate intergovernmental coordination so that decisions affecting local, state, and federal planning and development actions in the Hermiston area are rendered in an efficient and consistent manner.

6. The notice of proposed amendment was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days prior to the first evidentiary hearing in accord with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 660, Division 18.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands, Goal 4 Forest Lands, Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway, Goal 16 Estuarine Resources, Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands, Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes, Goal 19 Ocean Resources.

7. There are no tracts of lands subject to Goals 3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, or 19 anywhere within the city limits or UGB. These goals are not applicable.

Goal 5 Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Space, Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resource Quality, Goal 7 Areas Subject to Natural Hazards, Goal 8 Recreation Needs, Goal 9 Economic Development, Goal 10 Housing, Goal 11 Public Facilities and Services, Goal 13 Energy Conservation, Goal 14 Urbanization.

8. The proposed amendment affects citizen involvement procedures for land use decisions. No impact is made on allowed uses or land supply.

Goal 12 Transportation and OAR 660, Division 012

9. The proposed amendment does not affect trip generation in any way as no new uses are proposed or altered. Therefore, no new trips will be created and no transportation facility will be significantly affected as a result of the amendment.

Hermiston Zoning Ordinance §157.226

10. The proposed amendment was initiated by the city council on August 13, 2018 in compliance with §157.226(A).
11. The proposed amendment amends the text of the zoning ordinance, has a widespread impact on the city as a whole, and does not involve an amendment to the zoning map. Therefore, the proposed amendment is a legislative amendment as defined by §157.226(B)(1) and §157.226(C)(1) and (2).
12. Based upon Finding #11, the proposed amendment is not a quasi-judicial action and the approval criteria in §157.226(E)(1) are not applicable.

13. Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 30, 2018, more than 35 days in advance of the first evidentiary hearing as required by §157.226(F) and modified by ORS 197.610.
14. A notice of public hearing for the planning commission hearing was published on August 22, 2018 and the city council notice was published on September 5, 2018. Each notice was published in the Hermiston Herald at least 20 days in advance of the hearing as required by §157.229(D).
15. Based upon Finding #11, the proposed amendment is legislative and mailed notice to property owners is not required per §157.229(D).

Commissioner Fialka moved and Commissioner Hamm seconded to accept the findings as written. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Hamm moved and Commissioner Fialka seconded to recommend approval of amending the Hermiston Code of Ordinances section 157.231 to match Oregon statutory requirements for appeals of land use decisions. Motion passed unanimously.

Hearing- Conditional Use Permit Application- Head Start Airport

Chairman Saylor asked if any commissioner had a conflict of interest. Seeing none, the hearing was opened at 7:51PM.

The planning commission is holding a hearing to consider a request for a conditional use permit. The request must be approved by the planning commission subject to the criteria established in §157.208 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances. Umatilla Morrow Head Start has submitted a conditional use permit application for property located at 1407 Airport Way. The site is described as 4N 28 13 Tax Lot 100. The property is zoned Airport (A). The applicant proposes to construct a pre-school facility on a vacant portion of the lot.

Chairman Saylor read the following hearing guidelines:

The applicable substantive criteria relied upon by the City in rendering the decision to grant the conditional use permit are contained in §157.208 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.

Testimony and evidence must be directed toward the criteria described above or other criteria in the comprehensive plan or land use regulations which the person believes apply to the decision.

Failure to raise an issue by the close of the record at or following the hearing, in person or by letter, precludes appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) or the city council based on that issue.

Failure to raise an issue with sufficient specificity to afford the decision maker and the parties an opportunity to respond to that issue precludes appeal to LUBA or the city council based on that issue.

Failure to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval with sufficient specificity to allow the local government or its designee to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in circuit court.

Prior to the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional evidence, arguments or testimony regarding the application. The planning commission shall grant such a request by continuing the public hearing pursuant to ORS 197.763(6)(B) or leaving the record open for additional written evidence, arguments or testimony pursuant to ORS 197.763(6)(C).

For this hearing, the process begins with the staff report, followed by testimony from the applicants and any other supporters of the application. This will be followed by opponents to the application. Finally, a rebuttal by the applicant will be allowed. The public hearing portion of the procedure will then be closed, and the planning commission will consider the information and testimony received and may render a decision.

City Planner Spencer presented the staff report. Finding #10 should be amended to read Comprehensive Plan Policy 12, not Airport Hazard Zone. Draft minutes from the September 5, 2018, meeting of the Airport Committee were provided to each commissioner and are attached. The committee would like the commission to take their concerns into consideration.

Testimony

Dan Daltoso, 1073 W Highland Ave- Mr. Daltoso stated that Umatilla Morrow Head Start (UMCHS) looked all over for a place when they went to extended day classes. UMCHS is in odd locations across seven counties. They received federal funding to purchase the Diagonal Road bus barn. The City approached UMCHS to discuss moving their bus barn to the airport. The classrooms will be modular construction and the required insulation can be ordered. They are considering a covered area outside that should help with noise. UMCHS has taken into consideration the valid concerns raised and feels the airport is the best location in Hermiston right now.

The hearing was closed at 8:21PM.

Findings of Fact

The proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code.

1. The property is located at 1407 Airport Way and is described as a lease area within 4N 28 13 Tax Lot 100.
2. The property is approximately one acre in size. The existing building covers approximately 6,100 square feet.
3. The property lies within the Airport zone and allows uses permitted conditionally in the C-2 zone subject to issuance of a conditional use permit.
4. The Airport zone requires buildings to utilize M-1 zoning setback standards.
5. The M-1 zone requires no setbacks, except where abutting a residential zone, in which case a setback of 50 feet is required. The development site does not abut a residential zone and therefore no setback is required.
6. A public hearing was held on September 12, 2018 in accordance with 157.207(A) of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
7. Notice of public hearing was prepared and published on August 29, 2018 in accordance with the notice requirements of 157.229 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
8. The comprehensive plan has no policies relating specifically to the provision of preschools. Policies 25, 23, 16, and 11 relate to the location of elementary and secondary schools.

9. Preschools in the city's code are considered to be a much more low-intensity, quasi-residential use.
10. A pre-school is a noise sensitive use. The Comprehensive Plan Policy 12 requires residential uses within the 55 DNL noise contour for the airport to have extra insulation installed to meet 40 DNL noise requirements. The preschool shall have extra insulation installed to meet this requirement.

The property is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed use, together with all other zoning requirements and any additional conditions imposed by the Planning Commission.

11. A conventional preschool is required to have 1.5 parking spaces per teacher per 157.176 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances.
12. The applicant has provided the city with evidence that there will be three teachers, an administrator, and three teaching assistants on-site. Seven employees require 10.5 parking spaces on-site using conventional zoning requirements.
13. There are seventeen parking spaces on the property. These parking spaces will be shared with the bus barn on the adjacent lot.
14. The applicant has provided the city with evidence that there will be a total of 20 students per classroom.
15. The open space standard in 157.210(D)(1) requires 100 square feet of open space per student. There will be a total of 60 students and 6,000 square feet of play area is provided.
16. Head Start facilities are required to be inspected and licensed by the Oregon Office of Child Care prior to operation. The state inspection and licensing process provides the city with the assurance that issues which may not be standard city code requirements but which are necessary for the provision of child care are addressed.

Public facilities are of adequate size and quality to serve the proposed use.

17. The building will be connected to an 8-inch sanitary sewer line which extends from north to south across the property. No additional sewer connection is needed to service the proposed expansion.
18. The building will be connected to a 10-inch water line in Airport Way. No additional water connection is needed to service the proposed expansion.

The proposed use will prove reasonably compatible with surrounding properties.

19. The Head Start facility will not create an impact on neighboring airport uses in terms of noise, traffic, or other impacts.
20. Airport operations are likely to create noise impacts on the preschool. Additional insulation will be required to provide additional sound protections in the learning environment.
21. Head Start has operated within the city at several commercial and residential locations for over 20 years and has proven to be compatible with a variety of neighboring uses.
22. The outdoor play area will be required by the city to be fenced by a sight-obscuring fence at least four feet and not more than six feet in height.

Commissioner Hamm moved and Commissioner Caplinger seconded to adopt the findings as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

Conditions of Approval

Subject to the public hearing and testimony presented to the planning commission, the following conditions of approval are proposed:

1. The outdoor play area shall be landscaped with grass or similar fall material to provide adequate soft fall area for students.
2. The outdoor play area shall be fenced with a sight-obscuring fence of at least four feet and no more than six feet in height.
3. Parking lot lighting shall be designed and installed to avoid light pollution or to create glare in the eyes of pilots using the airport.
4. All exterior lighting shall be designed to not create confusion for pilots distinguishing between airport lights and other lighting.
5. The building shall have extra insulation to insure a 40 DNL noise level within the structure.
6. All areas for the standing and maneuvering of vehicles shall be paved prior to occupancy. The paved area shall include the 17 parking spaces shown on the site plan, travel lanes for the bus pick-up and drop-off, and other areas where buses will be maneuvering.
7. All storm water shall be retained within the boundaries of the development site utilizing either drainage swales or drywells.
8. The Hermiston Irrigation District shall provide certification prior to issuance of a building permit.
9. The City of Hermiston shall include cross access provisions in both property leases.

Commissioner Hamm Moved and Commissioner Caplinger seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit subject to the Conditions of Approval with the addition of Condition #9. Motion passed unanimously.

New Business- Final Plat Desert Sky Phase 6

City Planner Spencer presented the staff report. Desert Sky Phase 6 includes eight R-1 lots with seven new housing units and one oversized lot for future development.

Conditions of Approval and Findings of Fact

Conditions of Preliminary Plat Approval

1. The applicant shall work with and receive certification from the Hermiston Irrigation District prior to final plat approval. The City of Hermiston will not sign the final plat until the applicant obtains certification from the Hermiston Irrigation District.
Finding: The applicant shall meet this condition of approval. The necessary signature block for the Irrigation District is included on the final plat.
2. The west side of S First Street adjacent to each phase shall be improved to minor collector standards at the time each connection is made to S First Street. Street improvements to S First Street shall align with existing curb and gutter to the north of the development.
Finding: The applicant has met this condition of approval during earlier phases of construction. This condition does not apply to phase 6.
3. Applicant must sign an improvement agreement and shall install grading, storm drainage, curb and gutter, sidewalks, street paving, and all service utilities for this development. All improvements for each phase shall comply with city standards and specifications and shall receive final approval from the city engineer.
Finding: Improvements are still under construction. Final approval of improvements must be obtained prior to the city signing the plat.
4. Streetlights must be installed at the applicant's cost. Once installed, the City will assume the monthly service charges.

Finding: The applicant has met this condition of approval.

5. Applicant shall comply with all provisions of §92.12 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances relating to the control of blowing dust during all phases of construction.

Finding: The applicant has met this condition of approval in previous phases and shall continue to comply in all subsequent phases.

6. The applicant shall place a notation on the final plat stating that Lots 1, 6 and 28 shall not establish driveways on S First Street.

Finding: This condition is not applicable to Phase 6.

7. The new connecting streets designated "C" and "D" on the preliminary plat shall be designated with the SW prefix and designated as numbered streets or places based upon the addressing grid. The connecting street designated as "E" on the preliminary plat shall be designated with the W prefix and designated as a named Avenue on the final plat. The semicircular drives designated as "A" and "B" on the preliminary plat shall be designated with the SW prefix and be designated as named Drives on the final plat.

Finding: "D" Street has been designated as W Condon Ave. Since the street runs in a straight east/west direction, when addresses were assigned for Phase 5, staff determined a numbered street was confusing and required the street to be designated as an avenue instead.

8. The applicant shall be responsible for protecting groundwater flows through the subdivision and insuring all housing is protected from possible groundwater intrusions.

Finding: The applicant has met this condition of approval in previous phases and shall continue to comply in all subsequent phases.

9. The applicant shall be responsible for costs associated with modification of the Moore Avenue booster station pump sequencing.

Finding: The applicant will meet this condition of approval when development elevations are sufficient to impact water pressure.

§154.46 Final Plat Requirements

Per §154.46 of the Hermiston Code of Ordinances, the final plat shall show:

- (A) The boundary lines of the area being subdivided, with accurate distances and bearings;
- (B) The lines of all proposed streets and alleys with their width and names;
- (C) The accurate outline of any portions of the property intended to be dedicated or granted for public use;
- (D) The line of departure of one street from another;
- (E) The lines of all adjoining property and the lines of adjoining streets and alleys with their widths and names;
- (F) All lot lines together with an identification system for all lots and blocks;
- (G) The location of all building lines and easements provided for public use, services or utilities;
- (H) All dimensions, both linear and angular, necessary for locating the boundaries of the subdivision, lots, streets, alleys, easements, and other areas for public or private use. Linear dimensions are to be given to the nearest 1/10 of a foot;
- (I) All necessary curve data;
- (J) The location of all survey monuments and bench marks together with their descriptions;
- (K) The name of the subdivision, the scale of the plat, points of the compass, and the name of owners or subdivider;

- (L) The certificate of the surveyor attesting to the accuracy of the survey and the correct location of all monuments shown;
- (M) Private restrictions and trusteeships and their periods of existence. Should these restrictions or trusteeships be of such length as to make their lettering on the plat impracticable and thus necessitate the preparation of a separate instrument, reference to such instrument shall be made on the plat;
- (N) Acknowledgment of the owner or owners to the plat and restrictions, including dedication to public use of all streets, alleys, parks or other open spaces shown thereon, and the granting of easements required; and
- (O) Certificates of approval for endorsement by the City Council and certificate indicating its submission to the Planning Commission, together with approval for endorsement by other local, county and/or state authority as required by Oregon statutes.

Finding: All items required for the final plat are shown on the final plat.

Commissioner Caplinger moved and Commissioner Fialka seconded to approve the final plat with conditions as written. Motion passed unanimously.

Façade Grant Recommendation- 298 E Gladys Ave

Affordable Family Eyewear has submitted an application for a façade improvement grant for the building they have purchased. The estimated budget for the eligible work is \$27,981.

Alan Lambert, 50 W Beech Ave- Mr. Lambert stated the estimated cost of the renovations for the building will exceed \$400,000.

The commissioners scored the review sheets and it was determined to grant a 40% match up to \$10,000.

Planner Comments and Unscheduled Communications

City Planner Spencer updated the commissioners on the Union Club appeal and subsequent withdrawal of the appeal application.

The October Planning Commission meeting will include reporting on the fair from Mr. Davis.

Commissioner Frederic announced a name and gender change. Commissioner Frederic's name is now Sylvie Frederic.

Adjourn

Chairman Saylor adjourned the meeting at 8:56PM.

Hermiston Airport Committee - Minutes

Date: Wed., September 5, 2018

Members Present: Mike Martin, Dan Burns, Ron Linn, Ron Osgood, Linda Stark

City Representative: Mark Morgan.

Airport caretakers Susie Rawe

Gorge Aviation: Ron Berg, Rolf Anderson

Visitors: None

The meeting was called to order by Mark Morgan at 4:00 p.m. A quorum was present.

Roll Call Taken. Members absent: Mike Martin (Arrived later in meeting)

Minutes: A motion to approve August 2018 minutes by Dan Burns was made, seconded by Ron Osgood. Motion approved.

Board Comments: None

Airport Manager/Caretaker Report: Susie Rawe informed the committee that a runway slurry seal should be completed by the end of September. She also reported that the cars and 5th wheel owned by the Rawes would be soon moved.

Fuel system status. The Jet fuel "PRIST" fuel anti-icing additive delivery system has been repaired. Mascott Aviation is looking into a way for visual inspection as to when Prist is being delivered into the Jet A fuel.

Ross/Brandt development. The new development site has been excavated and a concrete slab has been poured. Utilities are currently being installed. It is the committees desire for the completed project at the time of moving to the new facility that they will store outdoor equipment in an orderly fashion.

Weed Spraying. Gorge Aviation, ASI, along with Mike Martin have sprayed weeds with work continuing to better control the weeds.

Flag lighting. Mike Botti will be installing a light.

Airport traffic pattern. The FAA would like the airport to adopt a standard 1000ft above ground level aircraft traffic pattern. Rolf Anderson will make the appropriate FAA contact and change.

Pancake Feed. Will be held at Gorge Aviation Saturday September 29th.

Airport open house and watermelon feed: Will be held on September 22, 2018 around 8 am.

Capital Improvement project. Century West will be notified to include possible asphalt on the south side of the Blue Hangar. This will improve on aircraft parking and hazardous dust control.

Shed area cleanup. This Friday the 7th a work party will clean up the area around the utility shed.

Financial Report: Provided and reviewed. On course with the new fiscal year.

Old Business:

Master airport plan and review. Century West was presented the committee's recommendations for adopting the plan B conceptual drawings. Location and layout of existing and new aircraft parking areas. These will be driven by new taxiway geometry.

Airport Signage. The current Airport roadside sign needs repair or replacement. The committee discussed a way to utilize the old sign yet make it more elevated, restored, lighted and landscaped.

Head Start Bus Barn. The committee discussed Head Starts request to add a classroom to the facility. Concerns were raised regarding security fencing, increased traffic, increased road asphalt wear, parking, and Hwy 395 road access. A motion was made by Ron Osgood and a second by Ron Lynn that the Planning commission take these items into consideration.

New Business:

Gorge Aviation and friends of the airport Hangar Dinner. A Spaghetti dinner is being planned for the evening of September 21st. Tickets will soon be available. Possible WW11 aircraft will be on static display.

Meeting adjourned: 5:25 p.m.

Next meeting: Wednesday October 3rd, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Ronald Osgood, Secretary

Facade Grant Application Review

Affordable Family Eyewear

Applicant

Todd Anderson

Review Date

9/12/2018

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	0
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	10
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	8
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	8
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	44

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match

36-47 points: 40% match

24-35 points: 30% match

12-23 points: 20% match

1-11 points: 10% match

38 = 44 points - 40% match

Facade Grant Application Review

Affordable Family Eyewear

Applicant Anderson, Anderson, Lambert

Review Date 9/12/18

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	5
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	10
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	10
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	8
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	9
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	8
Total	50

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match

36-47 points: 40% match

24-35 points: 30% match

12-23 points: 20% match

1-11 points: 10% match

Facade Grant Application Review

Applicant Jodd + Lorna Anderson / Marvin Lambert

Review Date 9/12/2018

*Affordable
Family Eyewear*

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	5
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	7
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	9
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	6
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	6
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	7
Total	40

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match
36-47 points: 40% match
24-35 points: 30% match
12-23 points: 20% match
1-11 points: 10% match

Commissioner Hamm

Facade Grant Application Review

Applicant ALAN LAMBERT 298 GLADYS

Review Date SEPT 12, 2018

Affordable Family Eyewear

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

*27.981

MATCH TO \$10,000

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	5
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	8
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	8
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	9
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	9
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	9
Total	48

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match

36-47 points: 40% match

24-35 points: 30% match

12-23 points: 20% match

1-11 points: 10% match

Chairman Saylor

Facade Grant Application Review

Applicant Affordable Fam. Eyewear
Review Date 9-12-18

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	3
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	7
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	7
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	5
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	5
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	37

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match
36-47 points: 40% match
24-35 points: 30% match
12-23 points: 20% match
1-11 points: 10% match

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant 298 E Gladys Ave , Affordable Eyewear

Review Date 9-12-18

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	5
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	9
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	9
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	8
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	49

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match

36-47 points: 40% match

24-35 points: 30% match

12-23 points: 20% match

1-11 points: 10% match

Commissioner Sargent

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Affordable Eyewear

Review Date 12 Sept 2018

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements consistent with type of architectural features found in the existing historical buildings in the district	5
Does the proposed improvement contain features designed to contribute to aesthetic enhancement?	5
Will the proposed improvements contribute not only to the enhancement of the commercial use, but the downtown as a whole?	6
Are the proposed improvements compatible with the overall downtown character?	7
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	9
Total	40

The maximum score possible for a grant is 60 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$10,000. For example, a \$20,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$10,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

48-60 points: 50% match

36-47 points: 40% match

24-35 points: 30% match

12-23 points: 20% match

1-11 points: 10% match

Commissioner Fialka