



PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting Minutes
July 8, 2026

Chairman Fialka called the regular meeting to order at 7:00PM. Present were Commissioners Caplinger, Doherty, Rebman, Serrano, Misner, and Kirkpatrick. Commissioners Hamm and Saylor were excused. Staff in attendance included Planning Director C.F. Spencer, City Attorney Rich Tovey, and Planning Assistant Heather La Beau. No Youth Advisors were present.

Minutes

Commissioner Rebman moved, and Commissioner Kirkpatrick seconded to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2026, regular meeting. Motion passed 6-0 with Commissioners Caplinger, Rebman, Serrano, Misner, Kirkpatrick, and Doherty in favor.

Final Plat - Fieldstone Crossing Phase 2 4N2815CA Tax Lot 1300 – 1653 SW 9th St

Planning Director Spencer presented the staff report.

Testimony

Dr. Tricia Mooney, Superintendent Hermiston School District- Dr. Mooney thanked the commissioners for their time and consideration in keeping this exciting project for the students and the community moving forward so they can continue building beautiful homes. The students are not involved in the land use processes of the project.

Chairman Fialka agreed it is a wonderful project providing great opportunities.

Commissioner Doherty moved and Commissioner Kirkpatrick seconded to approve the final plat subject to the conditions of approval. Motion passed 6-0 with Commissioners Caplinger, Rebman, Serrano, Misner, Kirkpatrick, and Doherty in favor.

Façade Grant – Christianson Realty Group 4N2811CB Tax Lot 100 – 398 E Ridgeway Ave

Planning Director Spencer presented the staff report. A façade grant for \$20,000 is requested for multiple improvements to a residential structure currently being used as a real estate office.

Testimony

Bennett Christianson 398 E Ridgeway Ave- Mr. Christianson bought the property last year and is excited to begin renovations to the older property to enhance the look to that of a commercial use and repair some deteriorating masonry.

Commissioners stated their concern with the amount of rock being used in the landscape. This may cause excessive heat and additional maintenance to control weeds. Mr. Christianson responded that he desires the more commercial aesthetic the rock provides and he is considering installing some vegetation if funds allow.

Upon completion of the scoresheets, the average score was 42 which corresponds to a 50% match.

Planner comments and unscheduled communication

Briefly discussed were water issues on SE 9th St and the proper verb tense for ongoing conditions of approval.

As the next regular planning commission occurs during Umatilla County Fair week, Commissioner Rebman moved and Commissioner Serrano seconded rescheduling the August meeting the August 5. Motion passed 6-0 with Commissioners Caplinger, Rebman, Serrano, Misner, Kirkpatrick, and Doherty in favor.



PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting Minutes
July 8, 2026

Adjournment

Chairman Fialka adjourned the meeting at 7:25PM.

DRAFT

Facade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	9
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	10
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	7
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	9
Total	43

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

Chairman Fialka

42.

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	5
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	10
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	10
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	10
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	45

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

Commissioner: Serrano

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	10
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	10
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	10
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	48

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

COMMISSIONER : Rebman

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	7
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	7
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	8
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	9
Total	39

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

COMMISSIONER : Doherty

Facade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	9
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	10
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	9
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	8
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	10
Total	46

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

Commissioner: Kirkpatrick

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	7
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	7
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	5
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	10
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	7
Total	36

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

Commissioner: Caplinger

Façade Grant Application Review

Applicant Christianson Realty Group

Review Date 07/08/2026

Scoring 0 pts to 10 pts

0 points = Does not meet the criteria

5 points = Meets most of the criteria

10 points = Fully meets the criteria

Criteria	Score
Are the proposed improvements designed to contribute to the long-term health of the site and district? For example, landscape improvements are not as durable as masonry.	8
Does the proposal add new aesthetic elements beyond the existing site conditions?	9
Will the proposed improvements enhance the economic well-being of the downtown as well as the site?	8
Are the proposed elements scaled properly for the site and of compatible color and materials for properties within 300 feet?	7
Will the proposed improvements enhance the value of the property and provide a good return on investment for the district?	9
Total	41

The maximum score possible for a grant is 50 points. An application meeting all of the review criteria would be eligible for a full 50% match. An application meeting a portion of the criteria would be eligible for a lesser match percentage. Grants are considered for up to 50% of the project budget up to a maximum award of \$20,000. For example, a \$50,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$20,000 match. A \$15,000 project would be eligible for a maximum of \$7,500 match.

Based on the scoring by the committee, grants are awarded using the following percentages:

41-50 points: 50% match

31-40 points: 40% match

21-30 points: 30% match

11-20 points: 20% match

1-10 points: 10% match

Commissioner : Misner