



MEMORANDUM

Virtual Public Workshop #1 Summary

Umatilla County U.S. Highway 395 North Zoning Code

DATE 10/02/18
TO Project Management Team
FROM Robert Waldher, County Planning Director
CC

The first virtual public workshop (VPW) for the Highway 395 North TGM Code Assistance Project went “live” online Tuesday, August 14, 2018, one week prior to the first Community Meeting held August 21, 2018. Originally the VPW was scheduled to be available for public participation for one week following the community meeting. However, the VPW was made available until September 16, 2018 to increase the opportunity for the public to provide input on the project.

The VPW was interactive, giving participants a chance to learn information about the project and also provide feedback on zoning, building and site design standards, access and circulation, and uses along the corridor. Throughout the 5 week period the website experienced 14 unique visits and 6 participants provided feedback. The following provides a summary of comments responses received for each category covered by the VPW:

Use Regulations (3 respondents)

Responses were mixed as to whether or not currently allowed commercial and industrial use regulations along the corridor were appropriate and regarding what uses should be prohibited. Some feedback appeared to indicate a preference for limiting industrial uses such as auto wrecking yards along the corridor.

Building Setbacks (2 respondents)

Both commenters appeared to favor the County restricting how far new buildings on the corridor can be set back from the street. Also, most respondents indicated that for new buildings on the corridor, the County should limit the amount of parking or outdoor storage areas that can be placed between the front of the building and the street.

Building Design (1 respondent)

Regarding building design, one commenter responded that for new buildings and significant renovations, the county should provide guidelines regarding preferred design elements, and go so

far as requiring specific design features as a condition of approval. The following design elements were ranked “important” by all respondents: façade articulation, middle-top design, window area, weather protection, entry design, and building materials.

Landscaping (2 respondents)

Two respondents agreed that for new buildings and significant renovations, the county should provide guidelines regarding preferred landscape design and materials, and go so far as requiring landscaping.

Screening and Fencing (2 respondents)

Responses about screening and fencing were mixed. One respondent felt that the county should continue to require outdoor merchandise displays to be screened and preferred that outdoor merchandise display areas be regulated the same as outdoor storage areas. Both respondents approved of the county providing guidelines regarding preferred screening and fencing materials. However, only one of the respondents felt the county should require or prohibit specific types of screening and fencing materials.

Signage (2 respondents)

Regarding signage, respondents felt that the County should further restrict the number and types of signs permitted on individual properties. Respondents also agreed that the County should further regulate the materials used for signs.

Lighting (2 respondents)

Overall respondents thought that the County should require that new development include a lighting plan and meet lighting standards to enhance safety on private property along the corridor. One of the respondents felt that future enhancements to Highway 395 should include street lighting.

Zoning and Design Standards (2 respondents)

Two general comments regarding zoning and design standards were provided by respondents. One respondent felt that “the area violated the provisions and goals of urban planning of the State of Oregon and further development outside of cities should not be encouraged.” Another respondent had concerns about buildings being built close to the highway because access to properties set back from the parcels fronting the highway would be limited.

Access and Circulation (5 respondents)

Opinions were mixed regarding bicycle and pedestrian circulation. Most respondents preferred that the existing sidewalks along Highway 395 should be continued to Bensel Road to the north. Some respondents preferred infrastructure for bikes while others did not. Respondents were split as to whether or not future development along the corridor should be required to provide on-site pedestrian walkways that connect from buildings to the streets through parking lots.

Prioritization (5 respondents)

Participants in the VPW were asked to prioritize which zoning restrictions or design standards they felt were most important. The following table shows the prioritization responses that were provided:

First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority
Restrict Commercial Uses	Restrict Industrial Uses	Screening and Fencing
Restrict Commercial Uses	Vehicle Access Management	Local Street Network
<i>No Response Provided</i>	Lighting on Private Property	Landscaping
Restrict Industrial Uses	Sidewalks on Highway 395	Screening and Fencing
<i>No Response Provided</i>	Highway 395 Street Lighting	<i>No Response Provided</i>

Other comments suggested street lighting as an additional priority and water and sewer utilities. One respondent felt that shared water and wastewater systems that mimic city utilities should not be allowed as they are already provided in Hermiston and Umatilla.

General Comments (4 respondents)

One participant encouraged the County to keep moving forward on the project and another respondent suggested a freeze on property taxes as an incentive for owners to make improvements to existing buildings.

Summary

The comments provided in the VPW combined with the input received at the first community meeting will be combined to help guide the Project Management Team and Umatilla County Planning Commission as they work toward recommended code amendments for Umatilla County Development Code. A second VPW and community meeting will be conducted later in the project, prior to adoption of the code amendment.