

Planning Commission Public Hearing and Meeting
Thursday, July 16, 2026

The Public Hearing and Meeting of the Arlington Planning Commission was held on Thursday, July 16, 2026, in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building and via telephone conference.

Commissioners Present: Nathan Hammer and Seth Danze

Commissioners Present Via Conference Phone: Ann Deen

Commissioners Absent: Joe Claughton

Staff Present: Assistant Recorder Taylor Grubaugh, Planner Kaitlyn Cook and Engineer Brad Baird

Guests: Tiffani Deal, Angie Sullivan, Leah Shannon and Jed Crowthers

Guests Announced Via Conference Phone: None

Open Meeting: The Planning Commission Chair, Nathan Hammer, opened the meeting at 6:00 pm.

The purpose of the Public Hearing is to consider a zone change from R-1 to R-2 for 14.362 vacant acres. The site is identified as tax lots 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 208 and 210 of Gilliam County Assessor's Map 03N21 E28CC. The application must meet the Arlington Zoning Ordinance NO. 443 Article 7.3 Quasi-Judicial Changes and Article 7.5 Approval Criteria for Amendments.

The Quasi-Judicial procedure is as follows:

1. Planning Department Staff Report.
2. Applicant's Testimony
3. Other members of the audience who wish to speak on the proposal.
Proponents first, followed by Opponents
4. Applicant's Rebuttal
5. Other public agency reports
6. Close hearing.

Questions for Commissioners:

- a. Does any Commissioner wish to disqualify themselves for any personal or financial interest in this matter before us tonight? None
- b. Does any Commissioner wish to disclose any bias, ex parte or prehearing contacts? None
- c. Does anyone in the audience object to any of the Planning Commissioners hearing this application? None

Opening Statement: Oregon Land Use Laws require that all issues be raised if the issues are to be appealed; failure to raise the issues at this hearing may invalidate their further appeal.

An issue which may be the basis for an appeal to the City Council shall be raised no later than the close of the record at or following this evidentiary hearing.

Such issues shall be raised and accompanied by statements or evidence of sufficient specificity to afford the City decision makers and the parties an adequate opportunity to respond to each issue.

The Commission may, at the request of a participant or on its own accord, continue the hearing to a date certain to provide an opportunity for persons to present and rebut new evidence, arguments or testimony related to the approval criteria.

1. Planning Commission Staff Report, as stated:

- a. Planner Kaitlyn Cook, AKS Engineering:** Today, we will be talking about a rezoning request from the Port of Arlington for seven parcels within the Alkali Ridge Subdivision. The request is to rezone approximately fourteen acres from Residential R-1 to Residential R-2. After accounting for roads and infrastructure, the applicant rendered that the acres are closer to twelve acres (Planner Cooks provided a map to the Commission. See attached map). This is a map amendment only. There are no text amendments to the zoning language or language in the Comprehensive Plan. This is a limited land use decision under ORS 197.195. Tonight, we are going to go over the high-level of what is included in the Staff Report (See attached Staff Report). The current zoning is seven lots, which are R-1, allowing single-family homes on 7,500-square-foot lots or duplexes on 10,000-square-foot lots. The proposed R-2 zone will allow for more residential unit types, additional housing density and development flexibility. Permitted dwelling types in this zone include single-family on 5,000 square-foot lots, duplexes, tri-plex's and four-plexes on 10,000 square-foot lots and apartments or townhomes up to one unit per 2,500 square feet. In the Staff Report, we go over what the needed housing is in Arlington. Arlington's current housing stock is skewed towards single-family detached housing at about 54%, with 29% being manufactured homes, 4% being duplexes, and under 2% being three- or four-plexes. There are no 5 five or more-unit residential developments right now. This rezone would add flexibility and opportunities for the development of these multi-family housing types, which are currently limited in Arlington. The Staff Report found that it supports housing near local employers, which aligns with the economic goal of the City of Arlington's Comprehensive Plan. Overall, it met many of the Comprehensive Plan's goals. The state-wide planning goals align very closely with the Arlington Comprehensive Plan's goals.

Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement: This goal is met because the standard local public notice was issued for the Planning Commission, and the public hearing is currently underway. However, the City submitted a notice of a proposed zoning map amendment to DLCD on July 1st, which was fifteen days prior to the subject meeting here tonight, and this is the first evidentiary meeting. This is less than the thirty-five-day period specified in the OAR's. The City and I contacted the Department of Land Conservation and Development and confirmed that they did not receive fifteen days' notice before the meeting, and they are aware of the situation. As of today, DLSD has not submitted a written objection or requested a continuance of the public hearing. Upon this conference, they are aware and they will reach out if additional time to review is necessary. They didn't object when it was first submitted.

Goal 2 - Land Use Planning: This is a small documented change and is supported by the Engineer's capacity memo.

Goal 5 - Open Space and Natural Resources: This goal is met because there are no wetlands, habitats or historic resources on site that would be diminished by the rezone, and all of the existing setback standards apply.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Resource Quality: There are no new uses outside of the housing types introduced, and the same environmental regulations apply to all new development, regardless of what housing type is proposed.

Goal 9 - Economic Development: This goal was met because more housing creates more opportunities and more workforce housing.

Goal 10 - Housing: This directly addresses the housing need in Arlington. This was found to be met.

Goal 11 - Public Facilities: As noted in the applicant's memo to the City Engineer, the capacity was confirmed for this specific subdivision.

Goal 14 - Urbanization: This goal was met because these land uses are already within the urban growth boundary, and no boundary expansion or alteration is needed to meet this goal. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance, the Staff Report found that consistency and compatibility have been achieved. The proposed R-2 development is compatible with the existing character of the subdivision and the surrounding residential areas, as it borders other residential uses. According to the City Engineer's memo, water and sewer systems have sufficient capacity for the build-out of the specific parcels being rezoned to R-2.

- b. **Engineer Brad Baird, Anderson Perry & Associates, Testimony as stated:** As far as sewer, there is a lot of grades (Engineer provided an image to the Commission; see attached image.) The sewer main lines that were just installed are standard eight-inch-diameter sewer main lines, which can handle higher flows when they are steep. They can handle anything that is proposed by the rezoning. The water is in a similar situation. In 2004, this City built the reservoir that is above the subdivision. That reservoir was sized to serve all of the city, not just the Columbia View Estates. We put a sixteen-inch water main out of the tank, a twelve-inch going into Columbia View Estates, and an eight-inch going down Main Street. It has enough fire flow capacity to serve the whole town out of that one tank, although there are two other tanks. The tank has more than enough capacity to serve the change that is being proposed. The only thing I would like to mention about the water system, and this has already been documented in prior planning actions for the subdivision, is that as you crowd the upper end of the subdivision, you won't have sufficient pressure as you get closer to the tank. Any development on the upper end would require some kind of booster pump system to maintain pressure. Down on the lower end, it would be just fine. Both the water and sewer systems are fine for the proposed. I would like to talk briefly about the roads. We are all aware of the roads the Port built through the subdivision. That road was built to city standards. The interesting thing about those standards is that there hasn't been a new road or a new subdivision in Arlington for quite some time. Where I'm going with this is now you have this beautiful road that is twenty-four feet wide, with drains on each side and sidewalks. It connects to two narrow roads, one of which leads into Columbia View Estates, and the other leads into Main Street. This is not intended to be any hindrance to what they are proposing, what they want or the approval of it. I went ahead and used a red pen on the figure I gave you (see attached map). I just extended the same width of the road that the Port built down through there. It's tight, but it could be widened. This is just something to think about. If apartment complexes are here, you are going to potentially have a lot of kids trying to get to school, and there are no connecting sidewalks from Alkali Ridge to the School. I'm not hinting or suggesting that, if development occurs, the developer will pay for the widening of the roads. This is just something that needs to be made aware of for everybody. This City, the Port and the County. It is dangerous by the school right now, with the current traffic flow, kids loading and unloading. This is just something to think about with the proposed development. Again, I would really like to emphasize, I'm not saying any of this to put the brakes on anything. I would like that a part of the record.
- c. **Planner Cook:** I think you bring up a good point. Even though there is a rezone, everyone still needs to go through the appropriate process. While the R-2 zone does allow for additional densities and apartments, currently in Arlington zoning ordinance, specifically article 4, section 4.15, Additional Conditions to Development Proposals, are talking about development that are likely to generate more than four-hundred average daily motor trips, that applicant shall provide adequate information, such as a traffic impact study or traffic counts to study the level of impact on the surrounding road systems. If there were to be an apartment complex or something of a

similar type, it would be the responsibility of the applicant to illustrate the impacts on the surrounding network if there were more than four hundred average daily motor trips. Thank you, Brad, for pointing this out. I would like to reiterate that the current road system is a sufficient for the proposed rezone within its boundaries. To conclude, staff recommends adoption of the subject zoning ordinance based on the findings of the Staff Report. If the zone change were to be adopted, it would rezone 7 legal parcels from R-1 to R-2 and create the potential for increased residential density on these parcels to make more land available for development of housing such as Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes and apartments. Following tonight's meeting, depending on the Planning Commission's recommendation, the subject application will move to the next available City Council meeting.

The following options are: **1.** Move to recommend adopting the zone and comprehensive plan map amendment from R-1 to R-2 with recommended conditions. **2.** Move to recommend adopting with modifications to the recommended conditions. **3.** Deny the amendment and retain the R-1 zoning.

There was a brief discussion between the Commission and City Staff regarding the current roadway system.

2. Applicant Testimony, as stated: Jed Crowthers, Port of Arlington

First, I appreciate the reviews that have been conducted and the process that has brought us this far to the hearing. I testify in favor of the rezone as submitted. My understanding of the Staff Report is that it is all in compliance and consistent with the City's rules, regulations, and State regulations. I don't think I have much more to add than what has already been submitted. Again, we showed consistency in demonstrating compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and all of the rules. I will say the subdivision was required to build some extra-wide streets because the City had only one street standard. Typically, when a development happens on a back corner of town, you might have some main thoroughfare wide streets down in the center of town and you would have a lesser width requirement up in the corner. This wasn't the case. The Port went ahead and built to the ultra-wide standard. The other things we did, the Port had to purchase property on the frontage of Main Street from the Cemetery, just to get to this forty-acre square of property. This is another off-site improvement that the Port performed. Bought the property, paved the street and then dedicated it to the City. That property cost \$50,000 just for the property and not to mention the construction of a brand-new street and the infrastructure that went there. Again, all of that was an off-site improvement. Another of sight improvement is the entry into Columbia View Estates. We took a more comprehensive and holistic view, realizing that loop street access coming from Main Street and entering into Columbia View Estates was in the best interest of the town over the long term. We have more than done our share of having two entry ways with that forty-feet of paved area. Again, we have a role to comply with the standards within our property and those that affect other uses adjoining or in proximity, but that doesn't mean that the port would have to make a sidewalk all the way to the school. That would be a city obligation. Our project did include sidewalks; I want to make that clear. You can see the sidewalks that the Port installed on this project. We did receive approval from the City Engineer to go ahead and have those on one side of the street, and specifically, it was chosen on that side to allow school kids to go down to the school. The other thing mentioned was the substandard width of the entryway street into Columbia View Estates. We made every effort to streamline and somehow mesh our forty feet of paving into the existing twenty feet of paving that is there. For that reason, again, the port has bent over backward to do our part on our property and on portions extending to other existing facilities. The Port should have no further responsibility to expand into Columbia View Estates or the street that passes through it. Some of that might sound

negative, but I want it to be crystal clear that we have done our part to follow all the City regulations. It was expensive to do so, but it is visionary for the future and in the best interest of future traffic flow and connectivity. This has added value to the city as a whole and not just to our property. We have been conscious of neighboring properties. You will notice that the areas we submitted are consistent with the preliminary plat, where we maintained R-1 zoning because there was testimony of a desire to maintain that kind of consistency; we did that. We are promoting the added density in those lower portions that aren't adjoining existing single-family. We have the buffering and separation to make that cognizant of those concerns to try and create cohesive, complementary development to what is here and to be able to explain those housing options for those other than just single-family homes. With that, I conclude with a firm testimony in favor of this proposal for the rezone and at the appropriate time, I welcome any questions and chance for rebuttal as needed.

Questions from the Commissioners for the Applicant: None

3. Public Testimony:

a. Proponent 1, as stated: Angie Sullivan, Land Wise

We are contracted with the Port of Arlington to develop this site. We applaud and are in favor of this. Right now, we don't know exactly what the design is. We kind of got held back until this phase was done. We believe we will bring townhomes and single-family homes onto smaller lots. Beyond that, I don't know what we are doing to bring. We are going to be cognizant of your four-hundred trip count. Other than that, I applaud the City for hearing this today. Thank you.

Questions for the proponent: None

Proponent 2, as stated: Tiffani Deal, Land Wise Real Estate Advisors

I am the real estate broker of the current listing of Alkali Ridge. I am absolutely for the rezoning. As I hear about the need for housing in the community, I think it's a great that they have submitted the rezoning application. It sounds like there is a big need in this community and I am definitely for that.

Questions for the proponent: None

b. Opponents: None

Questions for the Applicant: None

4. Applicant Rebuttal: None

5. Other Public Agency Reports, as stated:

- a. Engineer Baird:** I would like to make it clear for the record that I wasn't insinuating the port pays for these roads. As the City Engineer, I just need to point out that if a zone change makes it denser, that is a concern.
- b. Planner Cook:** This discussion and approval are all based on the evidence provided here tonight. It does not include future development or proposals. This is limited to the evidence provided in the Staff Report or in testimony tonight.

6. Close Hearing: The Public Hearing closed at 6:41 pm.

Deliberation: The Planning Commission entered into deliberation. The present commissioner reviewed and explained the images provided by the City's Engineer and Planner for Commissioner Deen, who was present by telephone.

Decision: Commissioner Danze motioned to recommend approval of the rezone to the City Council as presented. Commissioner Hammer seconded the motion. Roll Call: Commissioner Danze: Yes, Commissioner Hammer: Yes, Commissioner Deen: Yes.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nathan L. Hammer". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Planning Commission Chair, Nathan Hammer

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Taylor Grubaugh". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Transcribed by Assistant Recorder Taylor Grubaugh