



Planning Commission Meeting Brief

This brief is not intended to be a full account of the meeting.

Full Audio of this meeting is available on the City Web site www.Cityofprineville.com

Members Present: Marty Bailey, Jason York, Ron Cholin, Priscilla Smith, Erika Montgomery

Staff Present: Joshua Smith (Planning Director), Tasha Brackin (Associate Planner)

Provided Testimony: Lani Hickey (virtual), Rick Treleaven, Brian Palomo, Steve Caraway, Evan Caraway, Terri Black, Teddy Hussey, Stephanie Hussey, Sandra Thrasher, Kelsey Shane, Rick Claudson, Michael Hurley, Matt Hawes

Regular Meeting (5:30 P.M.)

I. Call to order: Chair called meeting to order, and the Planning Director read the meeting procedure.

II. Public Hearing: The Planning Commission reviewed and considered action for the following item:

A) Cu-2025-102 for a 9-unit multi-family complex in the C2 zone for use by BestCare Treatment Services.

Staff: The Planning Director gave a presentation describing what the application is for and how it will be used. The Director explained that as a multi-family development the project would meet the clear and objective standards for approval, however; the Director did not find that the project was compatible with the comprehensive plan or the purpose of the C2 zone. The Director stated that the project would be better suited within the existing treatment facility and recommended the application be denied based on the findings stated in the staff report. At the end of the public hearing and during commission deliberations the Director clarified that the decision needs to be based on the land use request for multi-family housing in a commercial zone and not on who may use the housing. If the housing were part of the treatment facility the conversation and application would be different.

Applicant: The applicant's representative (Lani Hickey) began by stating this type of application is allowed by the comprehensive plan if approved through a Type II conditional use process. Lani mentioned that there was a lot of residential in the area, the housing project would be well kept and was close to the treatment facility.

Rick Treleaven (BestCare CEO) submitted a letter into the record that provided context on who would be using the housing and why. Rick stated that placing the housing within the existing leased facility was discussed; however, the state funding for this project would not allow the housing on land they did not own. Rick clarified that the property was purchased with state funds and if the project did not move forward the property would need to be sold and money returned to the State.

Throughout the applicant's initial presentation and through the rebuttal the applicant continued to express the need for the housing and assurance that the project would be managed well, based on other facilities that they manage. They stated that an on-site manager is not proposed, but could be provided. The applicant also stated that this is not a homeless shelter and the intent is to transition people to other permanent housing when treatment is complete.

Public: Ten members of the public spoke in opposition, with none in favor or neutral on the proposal. The opposition was almost entirely about safety, regarding the proposed inhabitants of the housing units. The citizens spoke about numerous issues they have had with the clientele of the BestCare facility and the men's homeless shelter. They expressed serious concern over the mental stability of these individuals and their personal safety and safety of their families. Many expressed that they understood the need, but felt it should go elsewhere and not be concentrated in this area.

Commission Deliberations: During the public hearing the Commission asked the applicant several questions. Many of the questions revolved around site management, such as how other sites are managed, whether there would be an on-site manager, how food is provided and whether residents are required to be off drugs and alcohol. There was some discussion about foot traffic, access across the highway to the treatment facility, end of life for the project and whether it was possible for the treatment facility to move negating the convenience of having the housing nearby.

After the hearing was closed the Commission had a short deliberation. One commissioner stated they understood the need for the housing but preferred to see it on the site of the treatment facility. Another commissioner felt it was not prudent to put more residential near the floodplain or adjacent to the highway. Two others expressed the need to focus on the issue of residential in a commercial zone and not who would be using the property.

Decision: Priscilla Smith made a motion in opposition to the application based on the findings stated in the staff report. Erika Montgomery seconded the motion, and the motion passed with a roll call vote of 5 in favor and none opposed.

III. Planning Commission Matters:

- A) Staff asked if the commission was comfortable moving forward with a hearing on the TSP. The Commission had a brief discussion about the proposal for the West "Y" and the Peters and Main intersection. With no further input the Commission advised staff to move forward.
- B) Commissioners asked about the status of the UGB expansion for the potential biomass project. The Director provided a status update on the hearings process with the City Council and mentioned some of the issues.

IV. Planning Director's Report:

- A) Staff updated the Commission on the Combs Flat Extension, multifamily developments and various potential land use applications that may be submitted to City Planning in the near future.

Meeting adjourned: 7:43 P.M.

Next Meeting July 15th 5:30 P.M.