



**Pendleton Planning Commission
Future Land Use Public Hearing
October 27, 2005**

Minutes

Members Present

Teresa Horton Jim Noonan Dave Williford
Gussie Gibson Joe Pearson
Phillip Morgan Jim Smith

Staff Present

Steve Pelissier
Heather Colin

1. Opening, Establishment of a Quorum

Chair Teresa Horton called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM. With all seven members present, a quorum was established. She introduced the Dave Williford, the newest member of the Planning Commission.

2. Future Land Use Map

Steve Pelissier gave a presentation and overview on the draft future land use map. He thanked the public for coming to the informal drop-in prior to the meeting. He gave a brief presentation about the map and the process. He gave some background about smart growth, stating that Pendleton to engage in smart growth need to maintain the Town Center. He identified the differences between the 1999 one commercial category to the 2005 plan with the division of commercial into three differing degrees of commercial activity. Smart growth was also discussed as to sprawl and traffic patterns. He reviewed what a comprehensive plan is, specifically addressing the difference between the comprehensive plan and zoning. Mr. Pelissier discussed the impacts of the changes in the future land use map, in terms of traffic and population, and stated that the models do not work very well on such small scales. He referenced a chart that identifies the percentage of total land area by category and the change.

3. Planning Commission Discussion and Questions

Jim Smith brought up number 11 along South Mechanic Street. He suggested that the area be changed to neighborhood activity center. Mr. Smith made a motion to change the area identified

as number 11 to neighborhood activity center. The vote was 6-0-1 (Morgan abstained due to a conflict of interest). The motion passed.

Mr. Smith questioned the numbers about the percentage of agriculture indicated and brought up that the agriculture percentages in 1999 included Edgewood Apartments, which isn't really agriculture.

Mr. Smith also brought up area 8, across from the elementary school and asked that the Planning Commission consider changing the designation in that area. He suggested that the center area at the top where the proposed development is going to leave as medium density, everything to the south including the existing mobile home development to leave as medium density and change the areas to the west and east of the proposed development, revert back to agricultural. Mr. Smith made a motion to change the area as discussed, Pearson seconded the motion. The motion was discussed and clarified and Mr. Pelissier discussed the reasoning why it is acceptable to change the one area to medium density residential and leave the adjacent parcels agricultural. The public requested that Mr. Pelissier identify on the large map where the Commission made the motion for change. The motion passed 6-1 (Horton opposed).

4. Public Comment / Public Hearing

Ms. Horton stated the rules of the public comment and asked that the public use the citizen input forms.

Several members of the public addressed the Planning Commission, as noted;

Mr. Don Plotnik, property owner of property located at Broad and E Main Streets

Thanked the Commission for their work and thanked the Commission for the public notice and the brochure. He discussed how he came into owning the property in Pendleton. He stated that he is troubled by the proposed designation and the uses that would be permitted in the compatible zoning districts. He stated concern about if this area turns commercial and the possible widening of the road, eliminating front yards.

Mr. Pelissier responded that the next step of the process is to review the zoning ordinance and one part of that is the permitted uses.

Tim Hume, 504 S Mechanic Street

He had questions for the Planning Commission, one concerning number 8 on the map. He questioned the impact model that Mr. Pelissier discussed at the beginning. Mr. Pelissier responded that small areas do not give the best results, however, you look at a 15 year period and what could be developed should the area remain as is, then look at what could be developed if the area is changed and the difference of the two indicates the impact of the change. He also asked about number 10 and 21 which were designated in 1999 as agriculture/forest and questioned how the rezoning of those areas happened when they conflicted with the land use map. Mr. Pelissier discussed that there were unique situations and conditions with those issues, annexation was one of the issues. Mayor Carole Burdette helped to explain those situations, number 21 was an error on the map and number 10 was due to the annexation issues.

Alicia Sparks, 212 E Main Street

She questioned the shift from residential to commercial around the square and asked what it means, in terms of people who are living there now and plan on living there in the future.

Mr. Pelissier responded that the Square is a viable mixed use area, where people live with low intensity commercial. He stated that he could not state the impact on property values.

Robin Weeks, 1012 E Queen Street

She thanked the Commission on changing number 8, but asked that the Commission reconsider the 18 acre change to medium density and keep that as agricultural as well. She stated that Commission has to make sure that the change is in the best interest of the community.

Suzanne Patur Harney, 1015 E Queen Street

She continued on the previous comment on area 8. She is strongly opposed that portions of the area be changed to medium density residential, including the mobile home park. She questioned the multiple use of planned developments and stated that they should be used in more urban settings. She stated her concern of the proposed development across the school. She asked that the Commission require a traffic study and expressed her concern over the small lot sizes. She wants to see no smaller than 1/3 acre lots and that the Town look for more houses with higher disposable incomes.

She addressed Mechanic Street and the proposed commercial designation. She stated that the tree line entryway and historic homes are threatened by this designation. She also asked that Ridge Springs be required to submit a traffic impact study as well. She is concerned over the aesthetic change to the entryway to the Town.

Mr. Smith made comments, addressing the traffic issues associated with the school and that the development across from the school would most likely construct only 6-8 homes a year. He stated that the traffic problems from the school stem from parents dropping off children. The school traffic is more than what the subdivision will create.

Chris Harney, 1015 E Queen Street

He read a letter from Tim Drake who owns property within the Town. The greatest concern in the letter was the areas along Queen Street and South Mechanic. The letter addressed concern over historic structures in Pendleton and the tourism it creates. He stated the changes will strip Pendleton from its individuality and assist in its decline. The uses that will replace the residential through time will be a detriment. Mr. Drake asks that the Commission be careful with their proposal and the danger of long term consequences and more than bank accounts should be considered.

Jackie Reynolds, 306 E Broad Street

She has concerns about the downtown area and the historic significance of the Town. Heritage tourism is a legacy of the Town. Business should not be allowed to encroach on the historic homes, there are plenty of business opportunities around the Town square. The other area of her concern is the corner of Cherry and Broad Street. This street is very narrow and not appropriate for commercial development or anything high rise. The traffic along Mechanic Street and the proposed commercial development is another one her concerns.

Dolores Field, Heritage Oakes

She expressed her concern over the traffic on Mechanic Street, and making it wider will make it worse.

Sue Watts, 186 E Main Street

She followed on the lot on Cherry and Broad Street and reiterated the comments of Mr. Plotnik and Jackie Reynolds. She stated her concerns over traffic and safety along East Main Street and the spreading of business.

Pam Roland, 1613 Dannon Howell Road

She initially thanked the Planning Commission and their work and the better flow of information from Town Hall as well as complete minutes from the meetings. Her biggest concern is public input from the very beginning. It was explained that Town Council was responsible to inform their ward of the public meetings from the previous public meetings. She asked about the Ward meetings and attendance. The Planning Commission responded that they did not believe anyone attended Wards 1 and 2. She stated that the minutes state that mostly developers were the only ones with input, not the citizens, which appear to have guided the map.

5. Comprehensive Plan Update, Public Input Process

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 PM.