



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

May 15, 2024 at 7:00 PM

Boardman City Hall Council Chambers
MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Commission Chair Barresse called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Commissioner Jami Carbray, Commissioner Mike Connell, Commissioner Ragna TenEyck, Commissioner Zack Barresse, Commissioner Sam Irons (arrived at 8:07 PM), Commissioner David Jones, Commissioner Leighton

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion made by Commissioner Jones, Seconded by Commissioner Connell.
Voting Yea: Commissioner Carbray, Commissioner Leighton, Commissioner Connell, Commissioner TenEyck, Commissioner Barresse, Commissioner Jones

A. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes April 17, 2024

Motion to approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, April 17, 2024.

Motion made by Commissioner Jones, Seconded by Commissioner Connell.
Voting Yea: Commissioner Carbray, Commissioner Leighton, Commissioner Connell, Commissioner TenEyck, Commissioner Barresse, Commissioner Jones
Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Irons

The motion passes 6-0

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. CONTINUED - Conditional Use Permit CUP24-000001: City of Boardman, owner and applicant. Property is described as portions of the right-of-way for N Main Street and Boardman Avenue and is zoned Commercial, Tourist Commercial, and Residential. The request is to install a traffic signal meeting required warrants and improvements to Boardman Avenue between NE and NW 1st Streets to consist of full road - reconstruction, sidewalk, curb and gutter, storm drainage improvements, and on-street

parking. Criteria for approval are found at the BDC Chapter 2.2 Commercial and Chapter 4.4 Conditional Use Permits. It is being processed as a Type III decision.

Commission Chair Barresse opened the public hearing at 7:04pm.

Commission Chair Barresse read the rules of conduct of the hearing and asked the commissioners if they wished to abstain from this hearing. There were none.

Commission Chair Barresse asked if anyone in the audience wished to challenge any of the commissioners' impartiality. There were none.

Staff Report:

Planning Official McLane presented her staff report from the findings of fact and provided guidance on the changes to the staff report. The original proposal was for a streetlight at the corner of Boardman Ave and Main St. Changes to Boardman Ave. one block west and one block and a half to the east. Front Streets intersections with Main would also be converted to right-in, right-out configuration. What has changed is the light will be delayed and replaced with a Traffic Hawk (High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk Beacon). The Hawk is not much different from the Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB), but the Hawk is a smarter device that will stop flashing to allow traffic to move. It will stop the pedestrians and allow traffic to move. The RRFB only responds to the person pushing the button to flash and allow pedestrians to move. The City is maintaining the right-in, right-out at Front St. There are a couple of items that the planning department has done in red text and some in italics. The red text is a change to the current text and the italics is new text. Planning Official McLane explained that the infrastructure that will be installed for the HAWK will also serve as infrastructure for a future streetlight.

Planning Official McLane explained the Level Service Standard Grading from A through F. The Level of Standard for Front Street is C, which is not failing, but the delay is noticeable. D is working, but the delay is frustrating.

Testimony in Opposition:

Alex Hattenhauer, 122 W. 17th St The Dalles, OR.

Mr. Hattenhauer is the owner of the Sinclair gas station and convenience store. Mr. Hattenhauer is in opposition to the median that will significantly impact his business and wants to make a few comments, the 1320 feet, ODOT does make exceptions, it is not something that cannot be worked with. The City of Boardman is an older City, and the Loves gas station is closer than 1320 feet to the intersection. Sinclair was built in the 60's. Mr. Hattenhauer said that Sinclair was closed for 6 weeks for repairs. Freeway customers make up about 60-65 percent of his customers. Mr. Hattenhauer says that the plan for Front Streets is to close them completely and turn them into cul-de-sacs. He said that the City will ask for an easement to put the light in his property and he is not a fan of it. He is not opposed to the stop light, but he is opposed to the median. He is not a fan of granting an easement which the city can take if they want because they need it to do the footing to erect the footing of the support posts. He has budgeted \$1,000,000 and spent almost every cent of it on the infrastructure. He is invested in the community. Commissioner Connell asked Mr. Hattenhauer if he is aware that a left-hand turn has been made available into his business. With the HAWK system, the barrier will not be as long, and the left-hand turn will be available from Main St. The turn that will not be available is the turn to Front St. When the light does go in, the barrier will go the whole way in. By then, hopefully everyone will be used to

it, and it will be easier. Mr. Hattenhauer responded that it doesn't make him feel good not knowing that the language states "for now" which for him can mean 6 months or 5 years so it weighs heavy that it's coming sooner, and he doesn't like it. Commissioner Jones responded that he thinks that what Mr. Hattenhauer is trying to say is that what he is concerned about is that if the Planning Commission moves forward with this decision, at some point, it will be right-in, right-out and the infrastructure has already been put in to make it easier for the City to do that. Commissioner Connell responded that if not approved, they are limiting growth. Commissioner Jones responded that he recently saw the traffic in person for about 30-45 minutes and commuters were entering Sinclair through Front Street. Commissioner Jones stated that he is not sure what type of dangers it causes to the public.

Karen Purcell, 77298 Rippie Rd Boardman, OR 97818

Ms. Purcell stated that she agrees with Sinclair and says that until an improvement is seen, her business is killed. Customers are not going to be going around the block to go to the businesses. Sometimes it is hard to see changes, and this is just one of them.

Commissioner Carbray stated that she has been in Boardman for 3 years and she just found out today that there was a restaurant called The Village. She thinks they should have more visible signs.

Commissioners discussed signage options at the intersection to inform commuters of nearing businesses. Planning Official McLane responded that it is not a city function, but an ODOT function, and the business owners would have to apply to ODOT and pay the fee.

Neutral public testimony: There was none.

Rebuttal:

Planning Official McLane stated that based on what was heard at the last Planning Commission Meeting, the City made changes to the staff report. The City has also addressed the concerns about the left-hand turns into the Sinclair and Chevron stations. Accommodations were made based on the comments that were heard.

Public Hearing closed at 8:01pm

*****Planning Commissioners discussed their opinions on the Hawk.

Commissioner Connell said that he feels small businesses will be affected and although that saddens him, he does believe it is necessary to install the Hawk. Commissioner Connell asked Ms. Purcell if she knew the percentage of local vs freeway traffic going into her business. Ms. Purcell responded that the percentage is about 50% local traffic and 50% freeway traffic.

Commissioner Carbray shared that during the previous meeting, she had a lot of reservations about this request like not being able to make the left turn into the gas station, because of the impacts to the businesses. She isn't very happy about not being able to make left-hand turns onto Front Streets, but currently, left-hand turns at Front Street can be dangerous. The left-hand turn at Boardman instead of Front Street is not very far and could potentially help the businesses that are located near 1st St. Commissioner Carbray stated that most of her reservations have been resolved with the changes to the request.

Commissioner Connell stated that he would like to make sure that the City is doing their due diligence in helping the small businesses with directional signs to help

customers navigate the right-in, right-out turns. Planning Official McLane stated that signs on the freeway are ODOT functions and individual businesses would have to pay to have their business on ODOT signs.

Commissioner Irons arrived at 8:07pm

Commissioner Jones stated that he has a hard time allowing someone that is from out of the town, speaking of ODOT, forcing the City to do something that is damaging to the residents and businesses. Commissioner Connell pointed out that ODOT has their own set of trigger points and standards that must be followed. Commissioner Jones responded that the Planning Commission has a responsibility as well and would like to be able to ask ODOT to complete some tasks since they are asking the City to complete some tasks. Commissioner Connell responded that what ODOT is not doing is closing Front St. He stated that he was unsure of where Mr. Hattenhauer got the idea that ODOT wanted to close Front St. Commissioner Jones said that since the Main Street IAMP was created in 2009, it would be nice to look over it since Boardman has changed quite a bit since then. Planning Official McLane responded that there is a provision that envision Front St becoming right-in, right-out. In the IAMP, a level of Service C is identified as the trigger. Both north and south Front streets are a service level D, so based on the adopted plan, the requirement has been triggered to make Front streets right-in, right-out. Commissioner Jones stated that the City made the decision to sign the Main Street IAMP because they were trying to appease ODOT. He asked if it were true that the City signed the Main Street IAMP because ODOT said they would threaten to close Front Streets if it was not done. Planning Official McLane responded that there were two versions of the IAMP, the 2007 version which envisioned the closing of Front Streets. The community did not like the idea of Front Streets closing, so it was not adopted. The community worked with ODOT, the conversation was re-engaged, and the 2009 version of the Main Street IAMP was adopted which has the first alternative to turn Front Streets into right-in, right-out. The discussion of the closure of Front Streets is still in the Main Street IAMP, but the hope is that ODOT forgets about it. Commission Chair Barresse stated that he is a fan of the right-in, right-out because he drives through Main St. and said that driving is difficult around the interchange. He believes that Front Streets are a hazard and could be worse if the City does not do something about it soon. Commission Chair Barresse is concerned with cars backing up near the median but thinks that the changes from a traffic light to a HAWK will help.

Motion made by Commissioner Connell, Seconded by Commissioner Carbray.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Carbray, Commissioner Leighton, Commissioner Connell, Commissioner Barresse

Voting Nay: Commissioner TenEyck, Commissioner Jones

Voting Abstaining: Commissioner Irons

The motion passes 4 - 2 with one Commissioner abstaining

- B. Site Design Review, RVW24-000020: Van Voorhees, applicant and Joe Kumar, owner. Property is described as tax lots 100 and 200 of Assessor's Map 4N 25E 09CC and is zoned Commercial – Service Center. The request is to approve a hotel. Criteria for approval are found at the Boardman Development Code (BDC) Chapter 4.2 Development Review and Site Design Review along with standards in Chapter 2.2.180 Tourist Commercial Sub-District and Chapter 3 Design Standards. It is being processed as a Type III decision.

Commission Chair Barresse opened the public hearing at 8:18 pm.

Commission Chair Barresse asked if anyone in the audience wished to challenge any of the commissioners' impartiality. There were none.

Staff Report:

Associate Planner Orellana presented her staff report from the findings of fact. Although many of the conditions listed in the staff report will have to be addressed at the time of Development Review, there is one condition that is important to address before Development Review Application and will affect the type of hotel that is developed. Planning Official McLane shared more about the condition that was to be addressed. The applicant did provide a Trip Generation Letter that identified the type of hotel that would be developed. According to the Trip Generation Letter, the proposed hotel is a business hotel. The number of trips being assessed for the number of rooms identified would not require further traffic study. This development is located within the Main Street IAMP so the City has the same document and the same requirements to coordinate with ODOT. The City reached out to ODOT and the red flag that both ODOT and the City agreed to was that they identified the hotel as a business hotel. The difference between a standard hotel and a business hotel is usually a business hotel will allow longer stay and there would be less trips generated per overnight guests on a regular basis. Hopefully, the applicant will share why a business hotel as a part of their testimony. The City is not saying that they cannot do a business hotel, but because they are not doing a full impact study, there are impacts that will need them to mitigate based on those trips that their proposal will trigger. The City placed a condition and a trip cap. They cannot generate more trips than allowed for the type of hotel that will be developed. That does not mean that the City will ding them after one trip over the allowed trips, but if they are regularly having more trips than they said they would generate, the condition would allow us to go to them and they will either have to modify or have a traffic impact analysis. The manner in which the City would know if they were generating more trips than allowed is by visually seeing them. Customers will still have to go to the light located on Boardman Ave to make a left turn and get to the hotel.

Planning Official McLane explained how the process for notification to adjoining Landowner works.

Commissioner Leighton asked if Second Street will continue. Planning Official McLane explained that Second Street will not continue because it has Army Corps property to the west and The Village to the east. There is no additional road that will connect.

Commission Chair Barresse asked if the applicant would like to speak about the application.

Applicant:

Van Voorhies, 46 MEADOWLARK LN, TOUCHET WA 99360

Mr. Voorhies spoke about the different hotel types and what led to the decision to develop a business hotel. The proposed hotel will not have a restaurant.

Planning Official McLane asked Mr. Voorhees if he was comfortable with the trip cap. Mr. Voorhies responded that he is comfortable with it.

Mr. Voorhees asked questions about frontages and other development issues. Commission Chair Barresse responded that the questions asked are not a part of the public hearing, but Mr. Voorhees should follow up with the Planning Department.

Planning Official McLane went over the conditions of approval and explained what each condition meant and what was needed from the applicant.

Testimony in Opposition

There were none

Neutral Testimony

There were none

Hearing closed at 8:50pm

Commissioner Connell stated that the hotel development will help other local businesses including the Sunrise Café because the hotel will not have a restaurant.

Motion made by Commissioner Leighton, Seconded by Commissioner Jones.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Carbray, Commissioner Leighton, Commissioner Connell, Commissioner TenEyck, Commissioner Barresse, Commissioner Irons, Commissioner Jones

The motion passes 7 - 0

- C. Site Design Review, RVW24-000023: Angie Sullivan, applicant and Double T Farming LLC, owner. Property is described as tax lot 300 of Assessor's Map 4N 25E 11C and is zoned Commercial – Service Center. The request is to approve a flex building. Criteria for approval are found at the Boardman Development Code (BDC) Chapter 4.2 Development Review and Site Design Review along with standards in Chapter 2.2.200 Service Center Sub District and Chapter 3 Design Standards. It is being processed as a Type III decision.

Commission Chair Barresse opened the public hearing at 8:52pm

Commission Chair Barresse asked if anyone in the audience wished to challenge any of the commissioners' impartiality. There were none.

Staff Report

Planning Official McLane presented her staff report from the findings of fact. She also shared that a Flex Building is in high demand in our area and will do well. There are conditions of approval listed in the findings of fact that will have to be resolved at the time of development.

Applicant

Angie Sullivan, 2947 Blue Jay Street Umatilla, OR 97882

Ms. Sullivan talked about the application and shared the maps that were submitted with the application. Ms. Sullivan also stated that she is aware of the conditions of approval placed on the application and does not have any concerns.

Joe Taylor, 78597 Paul Smith Rd Boardman, OR 97818

Mr. Taylor shared information about his project and said that he is excited to get this project done.

Testimony in Opposition:

There were none.

Neutral Testimony:

There were none.

The hearing was closed at 9:03pm

Motion made by Commissioner Irons, Seconded by Commissioner Leighton.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Carbray, Commissioner Leighton, Commissioner Connell, Commissioner TenEyck, Commissioner Barresse, Commissioner Irons, Commissioner Jones

The motion passes 7 - 0

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Planning Official Report

Planning Official McLane presented the change to future Planning Commission Meetings starting July 2024 to 3rd Thursday in the month at 6:00pm. There was a consensus to make the presented changes to the day and time of the Planning Commission Meetings starting July 2024.

Planning Official McLane presented the document "Land Use Decisions: Who makes them, what is the process, and what is the role of each decision maker." and spoke about each process.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 9:24pm

A. Future Meetings

July 18, 2024

August 15, 2024