

MINUTES
YAMHILL COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

June 7, 2012, 7:00 p.m. Room 32
Yamhill County Courthouse
535 NE 5th Street
McMinnville, OR 97128

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair Alan Halstead.

1. **ROLL CALL. Present:** Daryl Garrettson, Matt Dunckel, Alan Halstead, Michael Sherwood (late), David Polite (late), Dan Armstrong, Bob White, John Abrams. **Absent:** Marjorie Ehry
Staff: Ken Friday, Michael Brandt
2. **MINUTES.** Review of minutes from May 3, 2012. Commissioner White moved that the minutes be approved as written; Commissioner Armstrong seconded. Motion approved unanimously.

QUASI JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING:

DOCKET NO.: C-13-11/SDR-11-11
REQUEST: Conditional use and site design review approval for a public park.
APPLICANT: Yamhill County Parks and Recreation
TAX LOT: 5512-300, 790 and 1700
LOCATION: 12555 SW River Bend Road, McMinnville
ZONE: PWS, Public Works/Safety, PRO, Parks, Recreation and Open Space and EF-80, Exclusive Farm use
REVIEW CRITERIA: Sections 402.04(D), 402.07(A), 405, 802.03, 1101.02 and 1202.02 of the Yamhill County Zoning Ordinance

Abstentions, Objections to Jurisdiction, Ex Parte Contact: None.

Continued from May 3, 2012 at the point of public agency reports

PUBLIC AGENCY REPORTS: Ken Friday stated that there we no additional public agency reports other than what has already been submitted into the record.

REBUTTAL: None.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Ken Friday gave the following recommendation:

The planning department has spent a substantial amount of time reviewing the record for this application and considering what the recommendation should be. Ultimately, we have decided not to make a formal recommendation for either approval or denial. However, we do recommend that your decision be based on the applicable criteria as noted in the staff report and that either the conclusions for approval or denial be adopted as part of your decision. We also recommend that, if it is approved, you include the 13 conditions of approval noted in the staff report with the following modification to Condition #2:

~~Camping is not approved as part of this application. Future use of the site for camping would need to either have an exception taken, or the camping plan would need to be adopted as part of a local park master plan as described in OAR 660-034-0040(4).~~

We recommend this change because we want to make it very clear that in order to allow camping there would need to be a new application filed.

The reason we are not making a formal recommendation is that we are county staff and this application is from a county department. And while our two departments do not interact on a regular basis, our recommendation could have the appearance of bias. In addition, and more importantly, this hearing body is made up of county citizens representing diverse backgrounds and interests. We believe it is more appropriate for you to make this particular decision without our recommendation.

DELIBERATION:

John Abrams: Doesn't feel it's the right time with the financial impact. Policing is going to be difficult; the area is a farming community, concerned about the ag related traffic on road.

Alan Halstead: Agrees w/ John Abrams, substantial financial impact on neighboring farms. Traffic impact.

Michael Sherwood: Thinks that the neighbors are correct with their concerns. Not the right place for a park.

David Polite: Concerned about the impact to farming on neighboring parcels and having the dump next door.

Daryl Garrettson: Abstaining because he missed the first hearing.

Matt Dunckel: Expressed several concerns. Feels it's not the right time to do it. Impact to farming could be significant. Is worried about why it is a buffer to the landfill. Is not sure if we actually need a park. Thinks it will change the characteristics in the area due to criminals. Wants the cost of whole project determined. Insurance- where does that money come from? The old landfill being a potential hazard area. Thinks the camping portion will compete with private business which is contrary to the park plan. Thinks there are too many questions that have not been answered.

Dan Armstrong: County needs to look ahead in order to promote growth and livability in the community. The parcel has drawbacks but doesn't think the county will have the money to buy riverfront property anytime soon. Security – not different from any other park in the county. Traffic – you always will run in to farm equipment anywhere in the county. Toxicity – Not sure that the insurance policy would change if it were a park or stayed the way it is. If we are worried about the toxicity, why are we growing wheat on it? Fence is a benefit to the neighbor. Wouldn't want to see state parks shut down for private owns. NIMBY arguments. County can shut down park if there are problems.

Bob White: Strong advocate of parks. Believes parks should be visible. Local impact and financial impact to the neighbors. 100 acre gift is a plus. Landfill is not a factor because the prevailing winds are coming from the other direction.

Daryl Garrettson clarified the toxicity issues regarding the closed landfill. No heavy metals were detected on the land, just in the river. Not a superfund site.

MOTION:

Commissioner Dunckel motioned to deny Docket C-13-11/SDR-11-11 based on the findings and conclusions for denial in the staff report. John Abrams seconded. **Motion passed 4-3.** (4 yes/3 no [Dan Armstrong, David Polite, Alan Halstead opposing])

5 min break

Other business: NFD scheduled for July 5, 2012. Likelihood for August hearing that will be a joint hearing with the Board regarding the bypass.

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.