

**MINUTES**  
**UMATILLA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Meeting of Thursday, September 26, 2024, 6:30pm**

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMMISSIONERS**

**PRESENT:** Suni Danforth, Chair, Sam Tucker, Vice Chair, John Standley, Malcolm Millar, Tami Green and Emery Gentry

**COMMISSIONER**

**PRESENT VIA ZOOM:** Kim Gillet

**COMMISSIONERS**

**ABSENT:** Andrew Morris, and Ann Minton

**PLANNING STAFF:**

Robert Waldher, Community Development Director, Charlet Hotchkiss, Planner, and Shawna 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.

**NEW HEARING**

**APPEAL OF PLANNING DIVISION DECISION TO DENY TYPE II LAND DIVISION REQUEST #LD-5N-912-24: KALVIN GARTON, APPLICANT/OWNER:** A “Request for Appeal” was filed on August 14, 2024 to appeal the Umatilla County Planning Division’s decision to deny Land Division Request #LD-5N-912-24. The applicant’s proposal is to partition the property located on Assessor’s Map 5N2722, Tax Lot 809. The applicant’s proposed partition would create three (3) lots of at least 2 acres in size. The Land Use standards applicable to the applicant’s request are found in Umatilla County Development Code 152.684, Type II Land Divisions.

Chair Danforth called for any abstentions, bias, conflicts of interest, declarations of ex parte contact or objections to jurisdiction. Commissioner Tucker stated he has known the applicant for many years and has represented him in the past. He has received several letters from the applicant in regard to this application but didn’t read them in detail and feels this should not influence his decision nor cause any conflict. Chair Danforth asked if there were any concerns based on Commissioner Tucker’s statement, no feedback was given. No other reports were made.

Chair Danforth called for the Staff Report.

## STAFF REPORT

Mr. Robert Waldher explained today's hearing is a "Request for Appeal" filed by Mr. Calvin Garton (applicant/owner) to challenge the Umatilla County Planning Division's decision to deny Land Use Request #LD-5N-912-24. The applicant's proposal is to partition the property located on Assessor's map Township 5N, Range 27E, Section 22; Tax Lot #809. As shown in the vicinity map (Attachment A), the subject property is located south of Highway 730 and east of Pleasant View Road. He stated the property is located along the Umatilla/Morrow County border, approximately three miles west of the city of Umatilla. The proposed partition would result in the following parcel sizes: Proposed Parcel 1 – 2.06 acres, Proposed Parcel 2 – 2.02 acres, and Proposed Parcel 3 – 4.02 acres.

Mr. Waldher added, the applicant submitted a Type II Land Division request to the Planning Division on March 4, 2024. Planning Division staff conducted a completeness review of the application and identified that the proposed parcel configuration did not appear to provide adequate buildable space required for rural residential properties, and staff noted several omissions in addressing the criteria of approval for the partition request. He described that the map (Attachment B) prepared by planning staff showed the lack of developable space on the subject property when required setbacks are applied. He added, on March 25, 2024, Planning Division staff emailed (Attachment C) the applicant and their surveyor, Mr. Bill Wells (Wells Surveying), requesting they submit the omitted information along with paperwork to assist in addressing the criteria of approval required for the Type II Land Division request. He stated, Mr. Wells responded that he needed to speak with his client and later requested staff delay sending out the Preliminary Findings until the applicant and surveyor had a chance to respond to the concerns. On April 8, 2024, planning staff followed up with a "Completeness Letter" (Attachment D) sent to the applicant and their surveyor that formally clarified what information was still necessary in order to proceed with deeming the application complete. He reiterated that the Completeness Letter stated the applicant had 180 days to respond to the requested information or the application would become void.

Mr. Waldher continued explaining that in April 2024, Planning Staff submitted a wetland land use notification to Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL), which is the agency responsible for administering removal/fill laws in the state. He added that a response (Attachment E) from DSL staff on April 17, 2024 identified the likely presence of additional wetlands and recommended that the applicant hire a wetland consultant to prepare a wetland delineation report for DSL's review and approval prior to any ground disturbing activities. The response from DSL was added to the project record.

Mr. Waldher added, on June 18, 2024, the applicant submitted a letter (Attachment F) to Planning Division staff disagreeing with the concerns highlighted in the county's completeness letter and requested the land division request to be processed immediately. Planning staff continued processing the application as requested by the applicant. He stated, affected agencies and nearby property owners were notified of the land division request and, on July 5, 2024, were sent a copy

of the Preliminary Findings and Conclusions which denied the land division request. The Planning Division received one email comment (Attachment G) from Morrow County Planning Department regarding access permits. He further explained, the applicant also provided a comment letter (Attachment H) during the 21-day comment period which disagreed with Umatilla County's decision to deny the request. No requests for a hearing were received during 21-day comment period.

Mr. Waldher stated a Decision letter (Attachment I) and Final Findings and Conclusions (Attachment J) were mailed on July 31, 2024 to the applicant and commenting parties. On August 14, 2024, before the end of the 15-day appeal period, the applicant filed an appeal (Attachment K) of the Planning Division's decision to deny the Type II Land Division.

Mr. Waldher explained the criteria of approval for Type II Land Divisions (partitions in a non-resource zone) are found in Umatilla County Development Code (UCDC) Sections 152.684. He added that the notice of the public hearing was mailed on September 6, 2024 to the owners of properties located within 250-feet of the perimeter of Tax Lot 809. Additionally, notice was also published in the East Oregonian on September 11, 2024 notifying the public of the applicant's request before the Planning Commission on September 26, 2024.

Mr. Waldher stated the Planning Commission is tasked with deciding whether or not to uphold the decision of the Planning Division to deny the Type II Land Division request. He stated either Approval or Denial must be based on substantive, factual evidence in the record, not conclusory statements. The decision made by the Planning Commission is final unless timely appealed to the County Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Waldher added they received comments from a few agency representatives and wanted to share those with the Planning Commissioners. These would be Exhibits L through O and would need to be added to the record. The first was a follow-up email from Wetland Ecologist, Jessica Salgado, from Department of State Lands, marked as Exhibit L. He read this in its' entirety. Mr. Waldher also stated that Ms. Salgado also included a list of qualified wetland consultants and provided a link as well.

Mr. Waldher further read an emailed comment from a neighbor, Mr. Justin Berry, marked as Exhibit M. He also read an excerpt from Exhibit N, Final Findings and Conclusions Garton Type II Land Division #LD-5N-881-20, approved in 2021. He stated the subject property of the current application is Parcel 3 from the 2021 partition that was previously approved. He added, previous criteria required the applicant to adequately address any known development limitations within the proposed land division, outlining appropriate mitigation measures. Planning Staff made the following finding, "Parcel 3 appears to be the only parcel impacted by the presence of wetlands. Furthermore, it will also be the only parcel that could be further partitioned in the future. Therefore, the applicant should develop a wetland mitigation plan when considering future partition configuration, as there is a limited amount of remaining land that would be developable. This

criterion is not applicable at that at this time.” Mr. Waldher stated he wanted to highlight these Findings were binding as of 2021, therefor the applicant has been aware of the wetland issue for some time. The Findings from this previous partition demonstrate that a wetland mitigation was formally suggested during previous permitting actions.

Mr. Waldher concluded with reading an email from Umatilla County Environmental Health Specialist Byron Morris, and in that email, he attached site evaluation reports that were done with the previous 2021 partition application. The site evaluations were only applicable to that project but some of the test sites were located on this applications’ proposed partition. Mr. Waldher quoted the email in its’ entirety, and he added this was done under the previous configuration, including a denial of one of the site evaluation reports. There were approvals for a capping and fill system in order to stay away from the water table. However, there were only a few sites where approval of a standard system was acceptable due to water not being observed in those areas. Mr. Waldher stated it was important to reference that in the report samples collected include notes where soils displayed hydrate conditions, such as modeling, saturated and red-colored soils indicated anaerobic conditions. He added these factors are traditional indicators of hydric soils or wetland-type conditions.

Commissioner Standley referenced Exhibit N and the map associated with the previous Partition application under #LD-5N-881-20. He stated on the map shows Pleasant View Road on the west side of the property, and an Umatilla Electric Cooperative easement extends east approximately 154 foot into the property. He asked if this easement is still in effect and if it serves the substation nearby. Mr. Waldher stated he still believed this substation exists in the northwest. Commissioner Standley asked Mr. Waldher if this area would not be buildable due to the easement. Mr. Waldher confirmed the applicant would need to follow the applicable regulations for this easement which means it could not be built within.

Commissioner Standley asked if there was any research regarding nearby wells. Mr. Waldher said that he was not certain of the depth of surrounding wells. Commissioner Gentry requested clarification on which part of the property the septic denial was from and where it is located on the map. Mr. Waldher stated it would have been associated with Parcel 6 of the previous partition done by Mr. Garton. He added, upon looking at the site evaluation on page 7, Exhibit O, Riley Lane runs east to west, the test pits are located north but quality of the image isn’t great. They can be identified as TP 1 and TP 2. Mr. Waldher also added, upon checking the Public Notice Map, there was a staff error with regard to naming the proposed partition, these should be listed as Proposed Parcel 1-3 and not Proposed Lot 1-3. Mr. Kalvin Garton interjected and was trying to show where the subject test area was located but was asked by Chair Danforth to wait for his opportunity to provide testimony until questions with staff have concluded.

Mr. Waldher stated the applicant might be able to clear some of the questions up, but that this information was provided by the County Environmental Health department. He added that there have been site suitability test pits dug in the vicinity of this project but nothing specific to this

partition, because these are typically completed after a tentative approval has been provided. He stated it would have been a condition of approval if the parcel is less than four acres to submit a site suitability test.

Commissioner Tucker asked about a policy question regarding Exhibit L, received September 13, 2024. He asked when a comment or exhibit comes in ahead of the hearing does a policy exist that instructs to provide a copy of those documents to the applicant. Mr. Waldher stated, there was no requirement in our policies that require that. The comment he received from Department of State Lands initially was addressed in the preliminary findings before a decision was made, but the most recent comment was received after the packet was sent out and a copy of that comment was not sent to the applicant. Commissioner Tucker asked if this is something we could do to help benefit the applicant to receive it ahead of time.

Chair Danforth asked if Staff had knowledge if Mr. Garton hired a wetland specialist at all. Mr. Waldher stated he was not aware if the applicant had hired anyone and had not included information pertaining to that in the application. Chair Danforth referenced Commissioner Standley's earlier comment regarding the transmission line and 154-foot easement and asked for some further clarification on the maps. Mr. Waldher stated he was unsure if it was either a distribution or transmission line, but on page 44 of the packet, it is listed as a blanket easement across this property. He stated page 45 shows a picture of the line, and also referenced Exhibit N, page 2, where it states, "Easement granted is to place, construct, operate, repair, maintain, relocate and replace electrical transmission or distribution line or system, including the right to turn trees, endangering overhead lines. Surveyors note the only visible UEC line in the easement area is the overhead service line near the north side of the easement area."

Commissioner Standley asked if the map on page 11, Wetlands Map/Buildable Space -Attachment B, indicates there is .34-acres of buildable space along Proposed Parcel 1. If this easement still exists, then this would encroach on that space and would no longer be buildable at that point.

Chair Danforth asked about Exhibit M, where Mr. Berry says an ad is running on this property being sold and stated a preapproval for a standard septic was received. Mr. Waldher stated the only information provided was from Mr. Morris, received that day as Exhibit O. He added, Mr. Morris did not indicate any new site evaluations had been completed. Mr. Waldher stated, the applicant would need to provide more information regarding if new approvals have been granted with the new configuration of this current application. Commissioner Tucker added that if they did approve any further site evaluations they had not provided the subsequent approval to the Planning Department. Mr. Waldher agreed that nothing further has been reported at this time.

Commissioner Standley asked the source of the water in the area is, and if this raises or lowers at different times of the year. Mr. Waldher stated he wasn't certain the source but suspected it could vary due to being closer to the Columbia River. He added, notes within the site evaluations from Environmental Health state saturation levels hitting at a depth of 20 inches. Obviously varies

depending on where samples might be taken from the land. Commissioner Standley asked if pressurization of the irrigation canals have anything to do with it. Mr. Waldher stated it could be the case, coming from the West Extension, but couldn't confirm for certain. Commissioner Tucker asked if a timeframe could be established as to how long it has been pressurized. Mr. Waldher stated he could not provide those details, but perhaps the applicant could advise further.

**Applicant Testimony:** Mr. Calvin Garton, 1328 NW King Street, Pendleton, OR 97801; Mr. Garton began by handing out some brochures of his ad copy. He stated, he's trying to sell the piece as one piece as a whole. He added there are two standard septic approvals. He then referred to the map and started explaining his intention of the road and new electric easement along the road and intend to request to bury the electric line. He stated, there is one line to one house and visited with the Umatilla Electric and reassured Planning Commissioners that is something Umatilla Electric said they could do with ease.

Mr. Garton explained he dug the test holes from north to south and stated he did a wetland study. He stated he hired someone to dig all the test site holes and they are actually deeper than a wetland study goes. He added that wetland studies only go 2-feet-deep and don't reach the water table.

Mr. Garton referred to the map on-screen, he stated the West End Extension Canal came through the area, and when the canal was removed and pressurized, the irrigation district put a drainage system to the pond and then water runs through a culvert and the water line goes under the road and it drains into this neighbor's pond to the east.

Mr. Garton stated a wetlands study has been done for years. He added that the Planning Department states there's not enough buildable area, but he didn't apply for three lots. He explained he applied for two lots. He further explained that he's developed all of the lots in this lower area and they don't sell very fast. He stated, they actually take maybe one to two years to sell one lot.

Mr. Garton stated when he developed these previous lots, every one of them had an impact of some kind to the wetland. He stated, his current application involves a little bit more. Mr. Garton spoke about potential other proposals but stated he had to change the configuration due to not receiving septic approval on some of the lots. He added he has standard septic approvals for three (3) different areas and a cap and fill approval as well. He stated he changed the configuration on the plat, so the septic would go along the north side of the proposed parcels due to sand with a depth of 10 feet.

Chair Danforth asked the applicant if he had a wetland study and why he didn't submit it. Mr. Garton stated he did the study himself, and that he is more knowledgeable than any wetland study will show. Chair Danforth stated he didn't hire anyone. Mr. Garton stated he did contact someone from La Grande, Oregon, but did not name the source, the quote provided was overly priced and it would be six months wait to get one completed. There were some round circle questions asked by Chair Danforth, Commissioner Tucker and the applicant referring to the wetland study. The applicant confirmed no new wetland study was completed by a professional but insisted Umatilla

County has a wetland study that has been mapped for years. Commissioner Tucker stated when a wetland study is completed a document is given to the requestor and asked if Mr. Garton has this document and Mr. Garton continued to state that the Planning Department has this documentation. Mr. Garton stated a wetland study is just a reason to say no, and that he was not trying to develop the part where the wetland is. Chair Danforth stated she asked the questions because the Planning Department recommended that a wetland study be completed and that was not done. Mr. Garton stated he could provide a better study because he dug the tests holes deeper than any wetland study would and it was a waste of money.

Commissioner Standley asked the applicant about the 154-foot UEC easement to the east and asked how he intends to build under that easement. Mr. Garton stated he was going to have the easement moved down the road and that the only line goes down to a house south of the property. Commissioner Standley stated he was referring to the transmission line and under this easement he would not be able to build underneath it. Mr. Garton stated he intends to move it and that he believes UEC would be easy to work with to get this changed.

Chair Danforth stated the applicant wanted to do three parcels in this partition. Much disagreement came from the applicant and continued for a bit between himself and continued controversy over the applicants' want to do a minor two lot partition between himself, Chair Danforth and Commissioner Tucker.

Commissioner Standley asked about the easement for the proposed cul-de-sac that goes through the middle of Proposed Parcel 2. He stated as a homebuyer he wouldn't want an easement to bisect his property to serve the purpose of others. Mr. Garton stated he understood with what Commissioner Standley meant, but stated the proposal offered by Mrs. Megan Davchevski, Planning Department Manager, along the north side and submitting a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) wasn't conducive with getting septic approval due to the wetlands. He then went into detail regarding the Planning Departments hindrance on saying no to his projects and that they do not have any vision for the future of Umatilla County. Commissioner Millar stated the Planning Department has said yes to many of the other lots he has developed. Commissioner Tucker stated the applicant's statements show many inconsistencies. Additional controversy from the applicant persisted and Commissioner Tucker stated again that the statements Mr. Garton has mentioned are inconsistent. Commissioner Tucker stated the Planning Department has said yes on many projects, but because they have said no on this project that makes him upset.

Commissioner Tucker and Mr. Garton went back and forth on the same subject regarding the previous approvals and controversy over their approvals for some time. Chair Danforth asked Mr. Garton to take a seat and stated the applicant hasn't provided any factual information to support his claims that would help rule in his favor.

Mr. Waldher wanted to clarify any discrepancies before moving forward because Mr. Garton made the point in which he only applied for two parcels in the partition. He passed around the surveyor's

partition plat submitted by Mr. Wells, that shows three parcels. He added, the current application was for two partitions so thus making three parcels. Mr. Garton added that he has done the same thing the past three times, and now the Planning Department wants to say no. He stated he would do the wetland study for the next minor partition, if someone doesn't purchase this entire parcel he'll split it again. He concluded that he has always created two new tax lots and the third remaining lot was always there.

**Opponents:** None

**Public Agencies:** None

**Rebuttal Testimony:** Mr. Kalvin Garton, 1328 NW King Street, Pendleton, OR 97801; Mr. Garton stated the wetlands are mapped and have always been mapped. He explained the irrigation company put in a pond and set the drainage to go there. He stated, the water table is from the West End Extension district and it's from their uncontrolled use of water, especially when they removed the irrigation canal and pressurized it.

Commissioner Millar asked if when he said pressurizing it, he meant they piped it underground. Mr. Garton agreed and said it was gravity pressure. Commissioner Millar asked if Mr. Garton knew how far from this location the irrigation lines were piped. Mr. Garton stated it extends past his property and up the hill above him. He added the water table is stable in this area. He also added, the Planning Department has made the setbacks further away from the wetlands to make it more difficult. He expressed the property has sand and that filters great. He is confident that he can do two more building sites in this same location next year and not just get three now.

Chair Danforth asked the applicant to demonstrate on the map where the irrigation canal was located. It was determined the piped irrigation runs east of Mr. Garton's property pertaining to this application. Commissioner Tucker asked where the open irrigation ditches are, and Mr. Garton indicated on the map. There was continued conversation over the ponds that have water, and which do not, and each Mr. Garton indicated on the map which were dry and those still holding water. Commissioner Tucker stated other than his word Mr. Garton had not supplied any information regarding proof to substantiate his claims.

Chair Danforth stated Commissioner Tucker brought up a good point, because if the ponds are dry and a new wetland study was completed then it would be applicable to his application. Commissioner Tucker stated the applicant appears to not want to spend the \$8,000 to get it completed. Mr. Garton added he didn't want to wait the six months wait to build two homes on-site. Chair Danforth asked how long he has been working on this project and what another six months would be. Mr. Garton answered he started these projects ten years ago, and expressed the cost was substantial.

Commissioner Standley stated, until the applicant can correct this easement and establish the ability to create a buildable lot, he doesn't feel comfortable making a motion to allow ground to



be built upon when this easement has been established since 1938. There was continued conversation about identifying the transmission line that was given as a large blanket easement and spans the distance of the Proposed Parcel 1. It was determined that space would not be buildable until the easement was removed and the applicant would need to do that before members of the Planning Commission would approve the applicant to build there.

Chair Danforth reiterated the application before the Planning Commissioner that evening. She stated the proposal includes three parcels. She restated the Proposed Parcel 2 shows two areas with possible buildable space bisected by a turn-around going through the middle of the parcel. She asked why someone would want to deal with having their property essentially split in two. Mr. Garton stated, so they can live in the country, there is no place else to live and not many places for sale. He added, he doesn't develop properties that aren't going to sell. Commissioner Tucker questioned Mr. Garton on his statement regarding there not being many places to sell and earlier stated that these parcels he's done prior are really not selling quickly. Mr. Garton interjected and stated it was because he requires stick-built homes and doesn't allow manufactured homes. Commissioner Tucker stated that there were lots of inconsistencies with his statements and reiterated his previous statement.

Mr. Garton explained, again, his requirement for development was stick-built homes. He added if he allowed manufactured homes, these lots would fill up quickly. He stated there was no exception to the Planning Departments approval and this was an admission of them stating no. Commissioner Tucker asked if Mr. Garton's major objection is the Planning policies and rules that apply. He stated, it seemed like the applicant had strong feels about those policies and perhaps he is justified, but other people might disagree. He stated until he is able to become governor and change the laws that the Planning Commissioner is going to be bound by the rules that apply to this situation. Mr. Garton stated he has not seen anything change regarding his ability to do a two-parcel partition each year. Commissioner Tucker agreed that he can still do two per year, so long as it complies with the rules the applicant does not like. Mr. Garton stated all he wants to do is a minor partition with creating two new lots, not three. He added, he will do the wetland study if he has to and believes his 5-foot-deep test holes, dug by Jim Hatley, are more accurate than any \$10,000 wetland study, when it has already been mapped. He added he has the ability to remove 50-cubic-yards of wetland legally and yet the Planning Department wants him to move another fifty feet away from the wetlands.

At that point Chair Danforth asked if any other Commissioners had questions for the applicant. Mr. Garton left the meeting without hearing any deliberation or decision from the Planning Commission.

Chair Danforth called for any requests for the hearing to be continued, or for the record to remain open. There were none.

Chair Danforth closed the hearing for deliberation.

Chair Danforth adopted the following exhibits into the record:

Exhibit L; September 13, 2024, Agency comment from Oregon Department of State Lands submitted by Jessica Salgado, Wetland Ecologist for Central & Eastern Oregon.

Exhibit M; September 24, 2024, Local Landowner comment by Mr. Justin Berry, 27298 Highway 730, Umatilla OR.

Exhibit N; Dated November 20, 2020, Pages 7 & 8 from Final Findings and Conclusions Garton, Type II Land Division #LD-5N-881-20, submitted by Mr. Robert Waldher, Community Development Director.

Exhibit O; September 26, 2024, Agency comment from Umatilla County Environmental Health Division submitted by Byron Morris, Environmental Health Supervisor

### **DELIBERATION & DECISION**

Commissioner Millar asked if a new wetlands study was done, could this have changed the information for the applicant in their favor. Mr. Waldher stated that potentially the wetlands could have changed, that is why a new wetland delineation was requested. The areas shown on Attachment B, which shows the wetlands in blue, are from the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), which is what the US Fish and Wildlife Service compiled in the 1970s based off aerial imagery and digitized at that time. He added, if you read the information from Ms. Salgado's response she speaks to the NWI document. Chair Danforth and Commissioner agreed that if Mr. Garton states it was completed, per his own admission, it could have affected his ability to make this application successful.

Mr. Waldher stated the NWI is a great desktop resource and that is how the Planning Department uses it. He stated, it looked like wetlands exist in the area and it likely needed further review and that is why we contacted DSL to let them know. Mr. Waldher added, that prior to his career with Planning he was a Wetland Specialist. He had personally performed a site visit at this location and based on his observations it did appear that there was hydrophytic vegetation outside of the area of what is shown on the NWI.

Commissioner Millar asked how recent the applicant's prior land divisions were and if no problems were observed with those applications. Mr. Waldher stated the previous partition was completed in 2021 and it was approved.

Commissioner Standley asked what obligation the Planning Commissioner has to hold the applicant to complete before they may develop it. Mr. Waldher stated, the applicant's submission was appealing the Planning Departments' denial, so this has already been denied by our department. He explained it is the Planning Commission's decision to either agree with the appeal

and find a way to approve the application or to uphold the decision by the Planning Department to deny the application. He added, if the applicant decides he wants to do a wetland delineation or figure out a fix for the UEC easement situation, then he could submit a new application to the Planning Department.

Mr. Waldher stated the reason the original Planner, Mrs. Megan Davchevski, who processed this application sent a letter to Mr. Garton and his surveyor, Mr. Wells, notified them of some of the potential issues with the application. He explained, we wanted to give the applicant the opportunity to correct those before we deemed the application complete and he chose not to.

Commissioner Green made a motion to uphold the decision by the Umatilla County Planning Department and deny the Garton Type II Land Division, based on foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

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

### **MINUTES**

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the April 11, 2024 meeting minutes. No additions nor corrections were noted.

Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the draft minutes from the April 11, 2024 meeting minutes, as presented. Commissioner Gentry seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the May 2, 2024 meeting minutes. Commissioner Millar asked if a correction could be made to his statement that was meant as hypothetical regarding the number of roosters someone could have owned on their property and compliance under the current code. No other additions nor corrections were noted.

Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the draft minutes from the May 2, 2024 meeting minutes, as presented. Commissioner Gentry seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the May 23, 2024 meeting minutes. No additions nor corrections were noted.

Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the draft minutes from the May 23, 2024 meeting minutes, as presented. Commissioner Gentry seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

Chair Danforth called for any corrections or additions to the June 27, 2024 meeting minutes. No additions nor corrections were noted.

Commissioner Gentry moved to approve the draft minutes from the June 27, 2024 meeting minutes, as presented. Commissioner Standley seconded the motion. Motion carried by consensus.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Robert Waldher stated we have a hearing in October for a rezone of a property along Highway 11 outside Milton Freewater. The property is owned by Click-it RV and the required 35-day notice was sent to the State since this is a legislative matter. During this hearing the Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Danforth adjourned the meeting at 7:50PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawna Van Sickle,

Administrative Assistant

**Minutes adopted by the Planning Commission on October 24, 2024.**