

Benton County Planning Department

Planning Annex, P.O. Box 910, 1002 Dudley Avenue, Prosser WA 99350, Phone: (509) 786-5612 or (509) 736-3086, Fax (509) 786-5629

BENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting, 10/15/2013
7:00 p.m. Public Hearing Room, Planning Annex
1002 Dudley Avenue, Prosser WA 99350

THESE MINUTES ARE SUMMARIZED AND ARE NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT.

ROLL CALL

	PRESENT	ABSENT
Lloyd Coughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martin Sheeran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rick Giberson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Darwin Crosby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
James Willard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

STAFF

Michael Shuttleworth
Susan Walker
Valerie Smith
Donna Hutchinson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Martin Sheeran seconded by Lloyd Coughlin, that the minutes be approved as corrected.

Vote:

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Lloyd Coughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martin Sheeran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rick Giberson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Darwin Crosby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
James Willard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- a. One year time extension request for the preliminary plat of Beierle

Addition - SUB 01-07. Applicant: Patricia Beierle

It was moved by Martin Sheeran and seconded by Rick Giberson to approve the consent agenda.

Vote:

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Lloyd Coughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martin Sheeran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rick Giberson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Darwin Crosby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
James Willard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Motion passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

- a. **Continued Public Hearing** - Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA 13-01, a proposal to add 1,263 land to the urban growth area of the City of Kennewick. The proposal site is located in Sections 17, 18, 19 and 20, Township 8 North, Range 29 East, W.M., located South of I-82 and east of the Badger Road Interchange on Badger Road. According to the City, the reason for the UGA expansion is to increase lands for available industrial purposes.

Staff testimony:

Mike Shuttleworth, Planning Staff noted that this was a continued hearing but that no testimony had been taken regarding this item. He noted that the applicant had requested that the hearing be continued. Mr. Shuttleworth noted that there were several attachments to the staff memo and read the exhibit numbers into the record.

Valerie Smith, Planning Staff, noted that the action before the Planning Commission was a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the City of Kennewick to add 1,263 acres of land to the urban growth area of the City of Kennewick. She pointed out the two large exhibit maps to the Planning Commission members; one that was a land use map that showed the City Limits line and outline the proposed area before the Planning Commission, and one that was an aerial photo of the proposed site. She then summarized the staff memo for the Planning Commission members and noted that the Planning Staff recommendation was found on Page 10 of the Staff Memo. She noted that this proposal was not consistent with the mandates and provisions of the Growth Management Act 36.70A, Washington Hearings Board Case Law, the Benton County Comprehensive Plan, the Benton County-wide Planning Policies, and relevant Benton County Codes. She stated that staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that CPA 13-01 be denied and then read the staff suggested findings into the record.

Ms. Smith then noted that since the staff memo was distributed, new information was submitted that satisfied item g.

Susan Walker, Planning Staff discussed the County staff analysis of the County's GMA Agriculture District designation process initially designated in 1995, and land use current conditions (**Exhibit PCM CH 1.16**) and explained how the analysis was created. She noted that the law requires that the County to consider their resource lands and that when you look into the Urban Growth Areas, you look for areas that are capable of supporting urban development. Urban development is usually characterized by housing, existing streets, public water and/or sewer, and electricity. The State says we have to look at our WAC codes to describe what kinds of things would be designated in the Ag district. The law tells us that we should not expand UGA's into designated agriculture, forest, or resource lands unless no other option is available. Prior to expansion of UGA's, Counties and Cities must first review the natural resource lands designation and conclude that the land no longer meets the designation criteria for resource lands of long term commercial significance. Ms. Walker noted that designated agricultural lands may not be located within UGA's unless the City or County has an active transfer or purchase of development rights. PCM CH 1.16 is an analysis of the requirements that the County considered when they originally designated this area back in 1995.

Ms. Smith read **Exhibits PCH 1.3, PCH 1.4, and PCH 1.6** which were received after the staff memo was published into the record for the Planning Commission.

Applicant testimony: Steve Young, Mayor of the City of Kennewick, gave a background on the reason for the submittal. He noted that the Southridge area of Kennewick does not have a lot of open ground most of it is under development at this time. He noted that there is also a lot of residential development occurring so that they are limited in the amount of land they have available for industrial uses. What land has been set aside in the City of Kennewick has been set aside for light industrial and for urban growth for housing and commercial services. He noted that the City's largest piece of property that could be used for industrial development is 17 acres. He stated that most of the businesses that have expressed interest in developing in Kennewick need more land than that and have developed elsewhere because of the need for more space.

Greg McCormick, City of Kennewick Planning Director, 210 W. Sixth Avenue, Kennewick WA handed in a paper copy of the PowerPoint presentation for the record, it was labeled as **Exhibit PCH 1.8**. He noted that the issues as they see them in the staff memo and some of the comments that have been received related to four different categories: 1) The land quantity analysis, we will talk about the methodology, 2) address the issue brought up by County Staff regarding the decreasing residential

densities, the Cities industrial land goal and the notion that the City has plenty of property that can be rezoned to industrial. The Capital Facilities Plan as County Staff indicated was supplemented by the City and did provide location capacities and funding but there were slides on that issue as well, 3) The Agricultural Land Designation and the conversion of Ag designated land and 4) the development proposal and phased Master Plan. Mr. McCormick then discussed the topics contained within the PowerPoint presentation.

Anthony Muai, City of Kennewick Planning Staff, explained to the Planning Commission members the calculations used within the UGA application and how those were obtained in a portion of the PowerPoint slideshow.

Greg McCormick, went through the rest of the PowerPoint presentation with the Planning Commission members.

Anthony Muai, discussed the Ag Land Conversion portion of the PowerPoint slides. He noted that agricultural lands are important to the State of Washington, especially the agricultural lands of long term significance, which is why there is stringent rules in the WAC, legislation and RCW's. There are however, no blanket requirement that says agricultural lands have to remain agricultural lands forever. He then went through slides on the PowerPoint presentation regarding conversion of ag lands. He noted that the majority of this property was in CRP and the contracts expire this year and next year. In talking with the land owner it was noted that the costs to farm the land have exceeded what he is receiving in revenue, so he put the land into CRP some time ago. Mr. Muai stated that the classification of prime and unique farmland soils as mapped by the NRCS was on a majority of this site if irrigated. There is a portion of the land that currently lies within the Kennewick Irrigation District and those lands are designated as non-irrigable and none of the other land in this area is being irrigated. The staff memo talks about Long Term Commercial Significance and the availability of public facilities including roads and he noted that the City currently had water and sewer near the boundary, less than a mile away and those are being used to serve current development that is occurring in the Southridge area. This area was included in the 2006 Water and Sewer Comprehensive Plan for the City. They have anticipated these areas to be served by sewer and water sometime in the future. There is access to the site from Christensen Road which comes in from the City Limits. There are currently power lines on the site and a proposed substation just across the freeway. There is no urban development on the site since it within the County and development is currently occurring at a fairly good pace in the Southridge area.

Gregory McCormick, City of Kennewick stated that the City's interest is not served by acting alone, it is a regional and cooperative effort. He stated that the County had stated that there was 22,000 acres of land available for industrial uses in the Tri-City region. He noted that he did not know where that property was but that there were huge areas designated industrial in West Richland and other parts of the County that

may or may not be really appropriate for industrial development. He stated that he was unsure where those numbers came from.

Lloyd Coughlin asked Mr. McCormick to pull up slide #9 showing the northeast side of the City. He noted that the Oak Street Industrial park was located in that vicinity, why is that not usable for industrial and why is the City not looking at moving east toward Yew Street and out that direction where back in the 1980's the City extended a water line from the water treatment plant up Chemical and down Bruno with the intention of feeding water to that area in the future and running a 12 inch line down Oak Street?

Mr. McCormick noted that the transportation system in that area was not optimal for industrial uses, the idea of extending industrial development along the shoreline could be problematic because of the restrictions in the shorelines areas and the sensitive areas in this vicinity would be much more stringent than any place else in the area. Yes, we did not look at that area specifically, we looked at areas within the City Limits in terms of redevelopment or rezoning potential and I have explained our thoughts on why we haven't considered those as viable options. We didn't look East as a viable option.

Lloyd Coughlin noted that SR 397 dropping down into that area which solves your transportation problems. You have two ways you can go, out to 182 or come across to SR 395 and out. It seems like that area which is not only close to your water plant but also close to your sewer plant versus having to pipe everything from the far South end of town down through several lift stations and booster stations to get back up there, it would be smarter route to go than way south into town.

Mr. McCormick stated that development is occurring in the south side of town and the City has spent a lot of money in terms of infrastructure costs and getting that ready because that is where the future growth is occurring. Another issue that they looked at east of town was that the largest parcel was probably not more than 10 acres and industrial users that are contacting the City was a minimum of 100 acres. There are not enough parcel in an area like that to assemble one 100 acre parcel, let along several 100 acre parcels.

Martin Sheeran noted that two years ago the County took land out of industrial uses and put it into Rural Lands 5. He noted that the City had not weighed in on that and that was ideal industrial ground that now is not available. It had railroad, river, everything there except for sewer and water for industrial use.

Rick Giberson stated that the City had indicated that they had been approached by potential industrial users and asked what types of industrial uses they were looking for industrial land? Mr. Young stated that there were several but that he could not be specific at this time as to what types of industrial uses they were.

Martin Sheeran noted that the prevailing winds at this site would not be conducive to processing plants. He noted that the property along the River within the County that was at one time industrial would have been better. It was noted that the area Mr. Sheeran was referring to was neither near city limits nor near the UGA.

Rick Giberson asked Mr. McCormick if he had filled out the SEPA Checklist and the DNS? Mr. McCormick stated that was correct, per County direction on how to address the SEPA issue.

Proponent testimony:

John Christensen, 3802 W. 43rd Kennewick, gave testimony regarding why his land is not being farmed. He pointed out the property on the aerial and noted which areas were in CRP and which were not. He stated that the reason it was not being farmed was that it was marginal farm ground that was productive and prosperous in the 50's and 60's. He noted that the cost of production outweighed the revenue. He then discussed what the CRP program was and answered various questions regarding his property.

B.C. Smith, 71105 N. SR 225, Benton City, WA, stated that he was representing the Building Trades Council, and noted that approval of this would create jobs for hundreds of construction workers over a period of years. He noted that the Council was in concurrence with the City of Kennewick.

Bryson Bailey, 7130 W. Grandridge Blvd., Kennewick, stated that he was representing the Tri City Development Council and that TRIDEC was in support of the expansion, he then read a letter into the record which was labeled as **PCH 1.9**.

Opponent testimony:

A letter from Linda Carpenter, 2923 S. Yew Street, Kennewick, read into the Record by Planning staff and was entered into the record as **Exhibit PCH 1.7**.

Roberta Lewendowski, 1615 W. Clark St, Pasco, stated that she was representing Futurewise and stated that they had submitted their comments and those were entered into the record as **PCH 1.1**. She noted that they had several concerns about the proposal and that they were asking the Planning Commission to recommend denial to the Board of County Commissioners. She stated that it was prime agricultural land and as others have said one of the main drivers of having a Growth Management Act (GMA) in the first place is that the citizens were up in arms when they saw the rapid loss of agricultural land in this state as well as across the nation. GMA was a way of saying that the best lands should be land designated as long term, non-changing agriculture where farmers can count on the fact that they can make an investment and count on getting their investment back. She noted that farming methods do change as Mr. Christensen pointed out, but that is not the only kind of farming that could occur on that land, it could be irrigated, maybe not, maybe some other form of agriculture,

maybe not. If the land is kept available it can be used again, so it is important to save agriculture land. Another concern, is echoing what people have said tonight, that Kennewick does have a lot of land that is vacant and underutilized, maybe it is not zoned for industry, but maybe it could be looked at for industry, certainly warehousing does not cause many impacts in a commercial area or even adjacent to a residential area and can be worked in. Also any kind of industrial development especially to a new area is going to take some taxpayer help to make that happen and in a city like Kennewick with all that vacant, unutilized land, especially in the old parts of town and even along SR 395, much better to put any public investment there to make those areas successful rather than spreading it out to one more area that is currently vacant and not needed. She stated that the State in the GMA assigned the job of deciding when urban expansion needed to happen to the Counties because the Counties can see the whole picture; all of the Cities, plus their own lands and what is needed for different kinds of growth and decide how to handle that. The legislature last year allowed a way to go forward without waiting for the County's regular update to the UGA, but that was in case there was an opportunity where a development came in and said we can't wait for the County to do their regular process, let's go ahead and we'll still follow all the rules of the GMA but we can't wait for the County's process. This doesn't meet that criteria because there is no development proposal, there is an idea that there could be a development proposal. She stated that Benton County is looking at the whole picture of the UGA next year and there is no reason to have this one go forward without looking at all the other UGA expansion proposals that are happening at the same time. Futurewise encourages you to recommend denial of this application, and even if a great new development opportunity comes along to please find nonagricultural land to put it on.

Bruce Hunt, Dept. of Commerce, Growth Management Services, 10 N. Post, Spokane, WA. stated that he had met with County Staff, the City of Kennewick, TRIDEC, the Port Commissioners, to talk about Urban Growth Areas, regional issues such as designation of industrial land and regional urban services and transportation improvements that are needed as well as the conservation of Benton County's important agricultural land. He then read the Department's comments (PCH 1.2) into the record and entered a photo of the site into the record as **PCH 1.10.**

Staff Closing Comments:

Susan Walker stated that there had been a lot of discussion regarding the analysis of the lands of long term commercial significance and there was some discussion about "prime land-if irrigated" and those were not the criteria that we used for determination of the lands of long term commercial significance, we used the Soil Conservation Soil Maps-NRCS and what they use is CFR (PCM 1.18) it is a Federal regulation which describes the prime farmlands. She noted that on Page 3 of the County Analysis (PCM CH 1.16) over 90 percent of the soils found on this site meet the NRCS prime classification of agricultural as so mapped by the NRCS soil maps survey. The classifications are found in the Code of Federal Regulations Title 7, they define prime

soils classifications on farmland throughout the US as those that have the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oil seed crops and are also available for these land uses. The lands could be crop land, pasture land, range land, forest land, or other land that is not urban built up land or water. It has the soil quality, growing season and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops; when treated and managed, including water management according to acceptable farming methods. In general prime farmlands have an adequate and dependable water supply from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season acceptable acidity and alkalinity, acceptable salt and sodium content, a few or no rocks, they are permeable to water and air. Prime farmlands are not accessibly erodible or saturated with water for long periods of time and do not flood frequently or are protected from flooding.

This goes on to determine what unique soils are, the County was required to protect prime and unique soils. The Soil Conservation District, Amanda Ettestad, referred the County to Keith Harrington who works for NRCS in the Pasco office and he is a soil scientist and he assured me that the State Offices do follow the criteria in the CFR for prime farmland. The County did not come up with their own connotations to our designations, if you make special attention to the analysis, it compares the requirements of the state law on the left side and on the right side it verifies how it was done and how this land is still suitable and capable of agriculture production.

The intent of the landowner to use the land for agriculture or cease such use is not the controlling factor in determining how the land is designated for agricultural use. Land enrolled in Federal Conservation Reserve programs is recommended for designation based on previous agricultural use, management requirements, and potential reuse of the agricultural land. So basically the state is pretty specific about how we designate and what is required to de-designate. De-designation requires us to say it doesn't have any of these qualities, it has urban encroachment, it's no longer suitable for agriculture and the County analysis does not support the finding.

Lloyd Coughlin stated that the research is saying that this is farmable land if properly done with the right crop. Some people may not have had the Ms. Walker noted that agriculture is not only the uses on that property is not confined to crop, you can also do other things with it. Also there is a definition of agricultural land and a definition for long term commercial significance. In Appendix 13, it says that Agricultural land means land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticulture, viticulture, floriculture, dairy, apiary, vegetable or animal products, berries, hay, grains, straw, seed...there is a wide variety of uses in the ag districts and ag lands. There are also other uses of the land for other commercial or industrial ag related uses.

There are a lot of other uses in ag lands around the County that don't rely on the prime soils as well.

Martin Sheeran asked if it was possible to have really good soil classifications but yet in a semi-arid or arid region it's still not feasible to farm? Ms. Walker noted that could be said about farmland anywhere in the County.

Valerie Smith, County Staff clarified for the Planning Commission the population figures and what they were based off of. She stated that was noted in PCM 1.4 which is the County Allocated Population Projections shown in Appendix 40 of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Smith noted that the City during their presentation had referred to the Arlington Case, she then pointed out that the Arlington Case site was different than this proposal because it was only 110 acres, it was surrounded or in close proximity to already developed commercial areas, it was on the same side of the freeway as the City and was in that case was different than what they were discussing this evening. This proposal area is separated by the freeway, the area is much larger, and is not surrounded by development and it is surrounded on both sides by large tracts of agriculture uses.

She noted that she had quoted that there were 22,000 acres of designated or zoned industrial land within the Tri-City regional and the Bi-Counties and that the information was provided by information provided within respective Comprehensive Plans. In the Tri-City area not counting the County unincorporated areas and not counting Benton City and Prosser that number is 17,186 acres.

Ms. Smith noted that four of the six parcels were currently located within CRP which is a majority of the property proposed here tonight for inclusion within the UGA.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Greg McCormick, City of Kennewick, noted that this land was designated in 1992 which was over 30 years ago and it is probably time to reevaluate that and based on Mr. Christensen's testimony there shouldn't be any argument that it maybe is time to reconsider the designation of GMA Ag on those lands. The City feels that there is that ability and there is case law there that allows the County to re-evaluate that designation and move forward with the change. The City has provided a Capital Facilities Plan that meets State requirements that shows that the City is ready, willing and able to provide urban services to this area. The City is not going to invest in moving forward with that until a decision is made relative to this application.

Anthony Muai, City of Kennewick, noted that County Staff had pointed out the CFR and the definitions used to designate prime farmland, he submitted an email which was entered into the record as **Exhibit PCH 1.11**. The email was an email string between him and NRCS regarding the farmland classification.

Martin Sheeran asked if having water is what made the farmland prime? It sounds like we are putting the cart before the horse if you don't have water and you have prime farmland. Mr. Muai noted that was addressed in **PCH 1.11**.

There being no one else who wished to testify the public portion of the hearing was closed.

Martin Sheeran stated that this ground is a unique piece of property, that it has future potential, whether that potential is readily available right now is the question. He noted that there were good points brought up on both sides. He indicated that he felt that maybe it was time to review classifications in that particular area for future as a County. He indicated that this was a little premature on entering it into the UGA.

Darwin Crosby indicated that he did not look at this dryland ground as being particularly viable to farm in this economy but is it prime farmland? This keeps coming up "if it's irrigated", well we know it is not irrigated, but there are certain provisions that still make it prime farmland for let's say a livestock operation because they are exempt from well drilling. The question is what its best use is; it is for dry ground growing grass, probably, is that program going to be there? If it is not the land owner is not going to farm it, probably no one else is going to farm it, so then economically it is going to be sold and it is a prime viable piece of 1263 acres.

Darwin Crosby stated that there were too many holes and too much variance between what the County found and what Kennewick found. The numbers are completely opposing each other. They are too far apart; there shouldn't be that much variation in the numbers. Maybe they need someone to come in and independently look this thing over and give us a quote from an independent source.

Martin Sheeran stated that the adjacent piece of property going west was similar in size and they did a residential community with clustering because they couldn't economically farm it. He noted that the numbers provided tonight were completely opposing each other; they were too far apart with too much variation.

Lloyd Coughlin stated that in looking at the RCW and going back to the property being designated farmland and changing from that designation would be in violation of RCW, and we have looked down that road before and it hasn't worked out for us. This is the cart before the horse, you can see it coming and still I agree with Mr. Crosby that this is farmland and does not have to be just for growing wheat.

Martin Sheeran noted that the allowable uses are very restrictive in GMA AG designation.

Dwight Crosby noted that the numbers provided tonight were too far apart. One set of numbers says yes it falls within this classification, the other set of numbers says doesn't classification.

Martin Sheeran stated that the other issue was Mr. Hunt that said he would be willing to work with these people if there was a viable development that came forward to put it on a fast track to be able make this happen. That could be an option in the future considering if something were to happen then the City of Kennewick looks like they are willing to put services there in the event that option was available. It looks like there still needs to be some planning, long range planning to be able to work things out.

Dwight Crosby noted that the roads in downtown old Kennewick are terrible and that the roads in the application area are better. He stated that he did not think that the numbers were there to go ahead and that we would be in violation.

Lloyd Coughlin stated that in the 1980's the water system was designed to go East, there are 12 inch lines going to the fairground, 72 inch line going down Bruno with the intention of feeding that area and there are a lot of wells east the water plant that have failed and they have extended the water line as far as Verbena. He note that with the Oak Street industrial area that they just remodeled if the City had multi-million dollar companies willing to come in here, then they could buy up property down there to rehab and build facilities down there.

Martin Sheeran stated that the area down there did have a lot of the attractive things about it; rail, river, roads, the site before us tonight does not. The area presented tonight has access from the freeway and that is it, doesn't have rail service or the river.

Lloyd Coughlin noted that for a processing plant the wind on the subject property if you have an industrial plant out there that has a chemical release into the atmosphere and it's not a good day, then you have horrible evacuation that you have to deal with.

Darwin Crosby stated that this application is not prepared enough for him to be comfortable with making a decision.

Mike Shuttleworth noted that the Planning Commission could ask for additional information if they feel that there is additional information they need to get the answers in order to make a decision.

Martin Sheeran noted that one of the issues brought was the densities.

Darwin Crosby stated that another issue was whether the property was prime farmland now or only if it was irrigated, there seemed to be a discrepancy there.

Rick Giberson stated that it was obvious that it is not really prime farmland now and it would be if it was irrigated.

Martin Sheeran noted that the designation right now is prime farmland. Susan Walker noted that it was farmland of statewide importance, long term commercially

significance. Lands designated for agricultural uses in Benton County are those lands with suitable location, soil characteristics, micro climates, slopes, water supply ability if irrigated, parcel sizes and acreage sizes, remoteness or separation from nonfarm residential developments.

Darwin Crosby- so it is not prime farmland? Susan Walker stated that the soils can be prime or unique in the County to get the long term commercial significance designation. Darwin Crosby - so it is prime farmland.

Martin Sheeran asked who would actually come up with the designation whether this is prime or not prime farmland. Susan Walker noted that this was designated already back in 1994 as long term commercial significance, the prime in the mapping is shown in the staff report, and according to NCRS they used the CFR's for their description of prime farmland and that is what is attached to your staff report.

After discussion by the Planning Commission the following motion was made.

MOTION

It was moved by Darwin Crosby, seconded by Lloyd Coughlin, that the public hearing for CUP 13-01 be continued for clarification of the density numbers and on designation of prime farmlands. Martin Sheeran asked for an amendment to the motion to add for clarification from the City of Kennewick regarding their time frame, whether they would pursue this proposal regardless of whether they have a developer interested in making this happen or not. Mr. Crosby accepted the amendment to his motion.

Mr. McCormick asked for clarification on Mr. Sheeran's comment - were they asking the Cities perspective if this is included in the UGA, will the City move forward in constructing or extending urban services into the UGA. Mr. Sheeran stated that was his question regardless of whether they have a developer or not.

VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Lloyd Coughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martin Sheeran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rick Giberson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Darwin Crosby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
James Willard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The motion failed due to the lack of a majority vote of the total number of Planning Commission members.

MOTION

It was moved by Darwin Crosby, seconded by Rick Giberson, that the public hearing for CUP 13-01 be continued for clarification of the density numbers, on the designation of


prime farmlands and whether the City of Kennewick would move forward in constructing or extending urban services into the UGA regardless of whether they have a developer interested in making this happen or not.

VOTE

	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Lloyd Coughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Martin Sheeran	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rick Giberson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Darwin Crosby	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
James Willard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The motion passed with a majority vote of the total number of Planning Commission members voting in favor of the motion.

There being no further business before the Planning Commission the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

 11/12/2012
MARTIN SHEERAN, Chairman DATE
BENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

**BENTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING**

Date: 10-15-13

ACTION/FILE NO. CPA 13-01

**PLEASE SIGN BELOW IF YOU WISH TO TESTIFY OR BE NOTIFIED OF THE
FINAL DECISION ON THIS ACTION.**

NAME	ADDRESS (including City)	FOR	AGAINST
Scott? Linda Carpenter	2923 S. New St. Kennewick WA		
JOHN CHRISTENSEN	3802 W 43 RD Ave	X	
Robert Lewandowski	1615 W. Clark St. Pasco		X
BC Smith	71105 N. 225 PRNE Benton (in)	X	
BRISON BAILEY	4313 S WAVALY KEN 99338		
CITY / Greg McCormick	City of Kennewick 210 W. 6th Avenue, Ken. WA	X	
Anthony Mai	City of Kennewick 210 W. 6th Ave., Kennewick 99336	X	
STEVE YOUNG	CITY OF KENNEWICK 1208 S. JONES	X	

Any information submitted to the Benton County Planning Department is subject to public records disclosure law for the State of Washington (RCW Chapter 42.17) and all other applicable law that may require the release of the documents to the public.