



CITY OF PRINEVILLE
Special Meeting Brief
387 NE Third Street – Prineville, OR 97754
541.447.5627 ph 541-447-5628 fax

Full Meeting Recordings Available at:
<http://cityofprineville.com/meetings/>

City Council Meeting Brief
November 4, 2025

Council Members Present:

Jason Beebe
Scott Smith
Marv Sumner
Steve Uffelman

Janet Hutchison
Jerry Brummer
Shane Howard

Council Members Absent

None.

Public Hearing – App 2025-100 for a 9-Unit Multifamily Complex in the C2 Zone for BestCare Treatment Services, Inc.

Public Hearing Procedure

Mayor Beebe provided an overview of the procedure for the public hearing this evening.

Mayor Beebe discussed ex parte communications, conflict of interest and bias.

Mayor Beebe asked if any of the Councilors had a conflict of interest to declare. No Councilors had a conflict of interest.

Mayor Beebe asked if any member of the Council had ex parte communications with the applicant or any member of the public. No Councilor had ex parte communications.

Mayor Beebe asked if there are any members of the audience who wish to challenge any member of the Council on any of the items on the agenda,

No members of the audience came forward to challenge.

Applicant Presentation

David Peterson, Attorney with Tonkin Torp Law Firm of Portland, Oregon is representing the applicant. Mr. Peterson explained that this proposal was actually brought to Council back in July at which time the City Council declined to hear the appeal which upheld the Planning Commission's decision to deny the application and they filed an appeal with Land Use Board of

Appeals (LUBA). City Council voluntarily chose to withdraw the decision not to hear the appeal.

Mr. Peterson provided an overview of the proposed project.

Mr. Peterson explained that he believes two state laws are relevant to approving this project. Mr. Anderson talked about the state laws he is referring to and discussed the two reasons why. He paraphrased ORS 197A.400, which he mentioned was mentioned in Mr. Smith's staff report as well. Mr. Peterson explained that he also submitted correspondence to the City Council that discusses this in greater detail this afternoon. Mr. Peterson continued to summarize the points he made in that correspondence.

Mr. Peterson explained that this project meets the affordable housing definition in Oregon statute. It would be available to Crook County residents and would meet income requirements of affordable. The housing would be for mental health patients enrolled in treatment with BestCare and is not a hospital and is independent living with no rent. It is not going to be developed within the floodplain.

Councilor Uffelman asked where the approved pedestrian crossing would be located for crossing the highway in a 45 mph zone.

Mr. Peterson responded that he is unaware of any pedestrian crossing being proposed.

Mark Rossi, Pinnacle Architecture said they spoke to ODOT and the two existing driveway approaches were the only thing they had to deal with. They are not required to do any other design requirements.

Councilor Uffelman stated they will be dealing with mentally ill patients who will be housed on the opposite side on the highway from the treatment services and you have not provided any safe crossing in this 45 mph zone?

Mr. Rossi explained that they were not required to.

Discussions continued regarding the residents will be Crook County residents that are in outpatient treatment services from BestCare for mental health and that it will help Crook County residents who are in mental health treatment with BestCare and income level requirements. The homes will not be portable and will be built on a foundation.

Councilor Smith stated that when they were considering site selection for this project, they were concerned about integrating the residential housing for high-acuity clients directly adjacent to the treatment facility was determined to pose potential safety and operational risks for both residents and staff. It is a concern for him that there is a safety concern for the people that are treating them and the residents' safety.

Mr. Peterson was unfamiliar with where that quote came from and is beside the point because the city is obligated to approve under state law and how it relates to applicable criteria.

Councilor Hutchison asked about the statement that reads, while no on-site staff will be stationed at the development, the main campus is less than 500 feet away, allowing for rapid response to any issues that may arise. Her concern that if any issues arise overnight or after hours if the staff is going to be available for rapid response.

Mr. Rossi responded yes. There is 24-hour staff, so staff will be available for rapid response. Again, these questions seem to be directed at the use and people who will be living there, rather than the development application. This is a housing application that meets the clear and objective development standards and is not about the medical conditions of the residents.

Jered Reid, City Attorney stated that the Council are asking these questions because they are concerned about safety and not the medical conditions and is based upon materials submitted by BestCare, which you don't seem to have. These questions again to clarify are based on safety concerns and not of a discriminatory nature. Mr. Reid explained to Council that the decisions have to be based on standards and law, and not made on any other basis.

There were no more questions from the Council.

Staff Report and Presentation – Josh Smith

Josh Smith, Planning Director, went through a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the project that they submitted the application is just for housing, and not operation of the housing.

Mr. Smith went through the criteria and provided some history of the property and that it is commercial and is on the highway. It's always been designed for commercial use with highway frontage. The site allows for residential housing above ground floor commercial as an outright permitted use.

There is a perfectly vacant space next to the BestCare facility and staff has been talking to them about considering this for the last couple of years. That would have been considering a housing/commercial consolidation that would also be an outright permitted use. In this case they applied for a new standalone housing development.

Mr. Smith displayed an aerial map of the site description and where the flood plain is in relation to the proposed development. If this were being developed in a residential area, we wouldn't even be here, because it meets the city residential development requirements. We are not disputing that they don't meet city development standards, just the use and purpose of the commercial zone.

Mr. Smith went through building elevations, dimensional standards and the development is meeting this criteria, public comments that were received and development comments were received from Crook County Fire & Rescue and ODOT.

Mr. Smith went through the general findings and the thought process used and state affordable housing laws changing so fast, that it is difficult for everyone to keep up with.

Wendy Kellington, a contracted Land Use Attorney, provided her land use attorney career background over the last 42 years.

Ms. Wellington explained that state law has changed a lot over the last couple of years, and the city code has not kept up with all of those changes. Two important changes have happened that she wanted to bring to the Council's attention. One is the standards, procedures, and conditions that are applied for approval or denial to an application for housing. It is a housing development application. Conditions must be clear and objective, and the state holds a pretty big hammer when it comes to that. If it goes before LUBA, it will be incumbent upon the city to prove the standards, procedures and conditions must be objective and there is not wiggle room. Staff have said that this project meets all of the clear and objective requirements of the code. You must approve this application based on that, and if you do not and go back to LUBA, the city will be exposed to pay BestCare's legal fees as well. That is just what the state has done, and it's not anybody's fault.

The other law to be aware of is the codification rule. If the city code does not include a condition such as providing a pedestrian crosswalk for connectivity, then the city cannot apply a that condition. That would violate the state's codification law.

The last set of rules, the standards & criteria that can be applied are only those that are in effect at the time the application was submitted.

Ms. Wellington continued to explain clear and objective standards and discretionary and when they can be applied. Ms. Wellington disagrees with the applicant's interpretation of property in the flood plain.

Councilor Howard asked if new state law about affordable housing allows a development to restrict access to other residents, such as BestCare's proposal to only allow those who are in treatment.

Ms. Wellington responded yes that there are all kinds of federal laws, such as 55 and over communities and more.

Mayor Beebe stated that the housing laws change every legislative session. Did we have a clear and objective path back when the application was submitted?

Mr. Smith responded that we were waving discretionary and applying only clear and objective because the laws were changing so fast and we stopped updating our code because the new state laws were just getting too significant. The city was waiting until the new laws slowed down for affordable housing and at the time the city was getting guidance from the Housing and Accountability office on how to apply our codes. That is something that hasn't been vetted by LUBA and would probably lose based on existing case law.

Ms. Wellington added to Mr. Smith's response and when they can or can't be applied.

Councilor Sumner asked could this have been avoided if they had just worked with staff on the C2 zone.

Mr. Smith went through the history of discussions with applicants, and the application process, the Planning Commission review, the LUBA appeal and bringing Mr. Wellington on board to help sort through all of the state law changes.

Mayor Beebe asked what happens if this was denied and it goes back to LUBA?

Mr. Reid responded that procedurally, if denied, the applicant would appeal this to LUBA. Ms. Wellington said that if it was denied, the next step would be to provide notice of the decision to LUBA. The appeal is sitting at LUBA on hold and so the applicant would not have to re-file. If you didn't file a decision, LUBA would just re-activate the appeal. Then the LUBA process will begin. BestCare could file a motion to have the city pay their attorney fees and they would probably get them.

Comments from City, State, County or Federal Agencies

No one from any of these agencies in the audience came forward to comment.

Councilor Hutchison asked Interim Chief Wilson to come forward to comment.

Interim Chief Wilson explained that he is not a land-use expert; however, in looking at how it is laid out, it is just a public-safety perspective, as always. There is a state highway there with a 45 mph speed limit, so crossing the highway is always a concern, and there are traffic issues.

Testimony in Favor of the Applicant

Mr. Reid asked that if anyone from the audience has questions of the staff or Council, for Council to please just make a note of the question for Council to ask if they wish to.

Camille Jones, 2nd Street – Prineville, talked about the safety on Madras Highway. Many people live there and walk there, including herself, and she gets around there just fine. Ms. Jones talked about listening to the questions that the Council was asking and their concerns for the people who would be living there, and if it is affordable housing. It is absolutely affordable housing; we have people living on the streets, and don't have the ability or look like the right people who can get the housing that is very limited here. Sees that there is a little bit of an objectification of people who have mental health or substance abuse issues, and they are people who live in our community, and we need to support them. They are here already and it's safer to have them off the street.

Mr. Reid made a reminder that you can only apply the applicable laws, criteria and evidence to the application. You cannot weigh who will be in the housing. The applicable law and criteria is ORS 197A.445, which has its own specific criteria.

Carri Bauer, Navajo Rd – Prineville, has 3 out of 4 children that lived a life like we see on the streets here in Prineville. My children are alive and have productive lives. Mental health issues that are often disguised by drug use. This isn't in my backyard because I don't live on Studebaker, but it was in my backyard and I lived through the hell of that. Loves this community and being a resident, but they are here and not all of them want help. Without a hand up, they are not coming out. This has nothing to do with the zoning, this is my heart as a mother. Wants to have accountability.

Sara Emerick- Crook County resident, a volunteer at Redemption House, these are women from Prineville that have had difficulties in their life and their stories will break your heart. With the help of the Redemption House, these women have been able to move back into the community again and become responsible citizens. There are so many in our community and housing here is absolutely not affordable. The price of groceries and housing and then you throw in mental health, this housing is desperately needed. It can make a difference and has seen a difference in the difference Redemption House has made.

No one else came forward, and no one online raised their hand to speak.

Testimony for Persons Opposing the Application

Terrie Black – Studebaker Dr – Prineville, my front yard is directly across the street from the non-fenced cluster housing will be built. This is her third time speaking to this committee about a second non-managed chaos center to be opened in our neighborhood. We have the men's shelter that is "managed" on certain days, it isn't supposed to be open 24/7, but it is. A previous cluster housing development that was proposed by BestCare and the City Planning Commission and it was denied because they wanted this property to be for commercial use. Due to a loop hole, the state attorney decided for our city and its residents that no matter what our city wanted that this cluster housing is going to be built on the commercial property. You drive by the Oasis in Redmond, and you see a fence surrounding the pods and an on-site management building. When it rains or snows the bottom of that property becomes a pond. We were told that the longevity of BestCare is not permanent. It is unknown how long these offices will be there. We were told that if a situation occurred that BestCare is across the street and could be there in a moments notice. What happens when BestCare is no longer there to manage the development the city didn't want? Then the city is left to deal with the mess.

Oniko Mehrabi – Prineville, wants to ask two questions. What happens when the lease goes away for BestCare? They used to be up at the old hospital which they lost their lease at. We need a clear statement from ODOT taking responsibility for these people playing frogger to cross the highway. We need to help people, but not by shifting responsibility and accountability on to the community. We have the best police and sheriff's departments. BestCare is a non-profit that doesn't have to pay taxes, we as property owners do which should provide us livability. We should be able to help those who want help to get better, but some don't want to. We need affordable housing.

Brian Burger, Studebaker Dr – Prineville, he never sees any one at BestCare at night. Talked about incompatibility and safety. There are children there. He was in Safeway during the

shooting. Why can't BestCare do it on the property they are at? It doesn't make sense. They bought the property before they had plans. Where is BestCare and why aren't they here?

Lorian Maxham, Hudspeth – Prineville, BestCare is leasing the property they are located and bought the property they want to build housing and thinks it is a legitimate question to ask them about what they are going to do when they leave? Who is responsible for these houses? You own the land, you own the houses what's going to happen? We need an answer to that and can't just assume. Big companies think they can push people around and need to hold them accountable and the long term plan.

Jeff Griffith, Studebaker – Prineville, knows that there is homelessness and mental illness all over the place and rented an apartment away from the tourist areas. He encourages our city to find out what they are doing and encourages BestCare to look into what they are doing. The place he visited didn't have cluster housing that you can see or tent city. That was a big city and we are Prineville. We have a great city. We need to figure out what is going on and address it. Don't hide it. There are kids in the mobile park and there is a bus stop right there. These people have problems and need help, but what stake in the game do they have? They aren't paying rent, they have no stake in the game in my neighborhood.

Ted Hussey, Studebaker Rd – Prineville, asked about the magic key and if it could be public safety? There are 32 kids who get on a bus there right next door. His kids will walk right by there. The new apartments being built will have kids. That is the only way and they will have to walk right past this place that is going to have people that are mentally not all there. He talked about an individual that had an altercation with the cashier and Towne Pump and it took three police officers to take him down. He knows that many of BestCare's clients are pedophiles. He has already moved away from BestCare once for concerns of his family's safety and now they want to move into his backyard again. It's not fair for his kids to have to grow up with this in their backyard. He sees it as a huge concern for his kids.

Stephanie Hussey, Studebaker Rd – Prineville, BestCare stated in their documents that they will be managing it, but may not in the future. That is concerning. There is no responsibility there. That property floods every year, and it isn't a good place for that to be. That property is commercial and doesn't know why housing right on the highway is being considered. Would love documentation that ODOT or BestCare would be financially responsible when someone gets hit by a semi. Talked about the school bus pick-up times for children from 5-18 years old. How bad to these people have to behave to get before they are kicked out? Talked about the residents having to share laundry and bathroom space not being a good idea and too many unknowns. The Police Department is across town and can take several minutes to get there because of logistics.

Brian Burger, Studebaker Rd – Prineville, talked about Oasis in Redmond and a resident there ran across the highway, caused an accident and one person did die.

No one else came forward. No one online raised their hand.

Neutral Testimony and Questions

John Gautney, Crook County Sheriff, he runs the jail and sheriff's office. BestCare is the one they contract with to provide services to the county. They work very closely with community corrections, they work with the clients and treatment programs. They have talked with BestCare frequently about needing a facility like this to get them off the streets. Whether this is the best location or not is your decision. He shared a personal story about his niece. We can't save everyone, but if we had a facility like this to get them off the street and get treatment, and we save just one person, we have been successful.

Dawn Mountz, Sunrise Ln – Prineville, is on the board of Redemption House, the men's shelter and homeless shelter on First. It is not true that the shelter is only managed part-time. If there are guests there, they have paid staff that is there. Thinks you would be surprised who these people are. Many work full-time and stay at the shelter because there is just no housing. Encourages everyone to just be open to who these people are.

Ryan Eldridge, 10th Street – Prineville, believes that what BestCare does is noble with good intentions. Just because they say it is going to go one way doesn't necessarily mean that it will. The biggest concern at this point is the attitude of BestCare. The sentiment has been safety about the pedestrian crossing. He believes BestCare shouldn't be that no one asked us to do that, so we are not going to. Rather than putting one in to win over the hearts and mind of the community, instead of just trying to shove this project in. Legally, they can build it, but maybe try to do it the right way. Maybe make the crosswalk because it is the right thing to do. Urges BestCare to do the right thing, go above and beyond, don't do the bare minimum.

Carrie Bauer, Navajo Rd – Prineville, the location is a terrible idea. There are many trips in to treatment as the first step.

Mark, resident of Prineville, asked Mr. Reid about vicarious liability. There has been a lot of talk of different safety scenarios. What kind of liability does BestCare have knowing that we have been discussing these safety concerns all evening?

Mr. Reid responded that he cannot give legal advice about BestCare, they are not his client, especially at a public hearing.

Terrie Black, Studebaker Dr – Prineville, asked how come when this was drawn up, how come it didn't include a fence?

Mr. Smith responded that there is a fence around the development and there is no on-site management. We can ask that they manage it, but we cannot require it, and they can always say they will manage it and then change their plans.

Ms. Black asked why the city can't just say no? Are we able to say how we want to run our city for what's best? Or is it Portland that thinks they know what is best for our city?

Mr. Smith explained that this is a conversation they have been having with BestCare offline, and to other points made, have asked them to do better. It is a needed facility, but the location is a problem. The location, from a zoning perspective, is why it was denied. They safety issues are there, because we don't know how it is going to be managed. If this was in a residential neighborhood, we would not be talking about crossings.

Ms. Black asked why they can't build it on the property they are leasing? No crossing, no kids, why?

Mr. Smith stated that BestCare has said they can't build it on the land unless they own it. This decision doesn't mean that it still could not be a possibility. They submitted it as a housing development, and we are looking at this as strictly a housing development.

Ms. Black stated she just wants this to be our city and not tell us what to do with our city.

A five (5) minute break was called at 7:55 P.M.

Meeting reconvened at 8:00 P.M.

Mayor Beebe explained that we were in neutral testimony and questions prior to the break.

No one else came forward, and no one online raised their hand.

Applicant Rebuttal

Mr. Peterson thanked the comments they received in the beginning and the Sheriff. This is not a fly by night operation. BestCare has been in business in Prineville since 1997. They have many locations across Central Oregon. They treat mental health issues and substance abuse. They are well regarded in the state for providing quality services and run a tight ship. He doesn't feel it is fair to characterize BestCare as a fly by night operation that will disappear tomorrow. This is not transitional housing for someone who just gets out of prison. This is there last step for people who are ready to go fully independent. These are people that have made a fair amount of progress to reenter society.

BestCare cannot just go out a willy nilly build a crosswalk across a state highway. ODOT did not require one. It's not like the 9 people in this facility are going to be the only ones that cross this highway.

Mr. Peterson redirected Council to Ms. Wellington recommendation. Doesn't see how this project cannot be approved by law. We look forward to building this project in your community and helping some of your most vulnerable population.

Mr. Rossi has no additional comments.

Council Questions While on the Record

Councilor Howard directed his question to Mr. Peterson stating that BestCare is largely funded by Measure 110, is that correct?

Mr. Peterson responded that he had no idea.

Councilor Howard said that based on his research, that appears to be the case. Measure 110 has already been reformed once and does he think BestCare could desolve if they lost funding. That would be a concern if a facility like this was built and then lost funding.

Mr. Rossi explained that these were designed so that in the event that they did fail, they could turn around and rent these as single-family homes, like tiny homes, if they lose funding in the future as market rate housing.

Mr. Smith asked about the 30 year deed restriction and how that would work if they lost funding and couldn't operate.

Mr. Peterson clarified that it is a 20 year deed restriction for the grant requirement and the 30 year deed restriction is for the affordable housing requirement.

Councilor Uffelman said that with the absence of a safe crossing, while ODOT has not required that, and we are dealing with a specific category of housing for mentally ill patients, which is not what ODOT would typically be dealing with, is there not the ability to revise the specifics requiring a safe crossing. When he reads the materials they provided, they talk about a 500-foot separation. A 500-foot separation does not permit leaving the housing project down to 9th Street, and cross at 9th Street, and then go back up to the treatment facility. They are talking about just going across the street. That is not acceptable. They talk about the crossing that isn't designated at 9th and Studebaker.

Mr. Smith responded regarding the numerous conversations with ODOT, and they didn't have a reason or a nexus to require it. It didn't meet the threshold to require it. They tied this project together with the treatment facility, which is what is causing the issue. It's not a matter of whether they wanted it or not. It's that they couldn't require it in a land use decision.

Councilor Uffelman asked why as a city, why can't we require them to provide a safe crossing across the highway with a marked highway crossing for vehicles traveling at 40 mph.

Mr. Smith stated that you probably can, but it would likely get appealed and overturned.

Ms. Wellington explained that this is ODOT's domain and ODOT is the agency that even after you make your decision, can address this during the permitting process.

Mr. Smith stated that ODOT said they don't need a permit because there is already a permitted access.

Ms. Wellington explained what the typical process would be. The city does not have a clear and objective option to have the city make this requirement and ODOT would probably, or may or may not honor it, because it is their facility. Though it is a really good idea, it is not a legal idea. It wouldn't move the safety ball forward, because we would not be able to hold onto it. It would hang at LUBA for 6 – 8 months before they reverse it because the city would have entered into ODOT's domain and wouldn't recommend that condition because she is not aware of any codified standard in the city code that would give rise to it, that was in effect at the time the application was submitted, or a clear and objective basis to do it. It's possible that ODOT can reconsider since they haven't made a final decision yet. There is a funny case out there right now about whether requirements for roads and highways have to be clear and objective. It was determined that it only applies to housing, but feels it could be overturned at the Supreme Court.

Ms. Wellington added that we are here to make a decision on the development based on the clear and objective criteria.

Mr. Reid clarified that this is on housing analysis and not the use, the affordable housing is tied to BestCare. If there was a clear and objective pathway that they didn't meet, then the city could be discretionary. Per Ms. Wellington's advise, the city does not have a clear and objective pathway. Therefore does not have discretionary options to utilize.

Mr. Smith added that he asked for the narrative of the project. If it was in the city street network.

Ms. Wellington said even though there is no basis to deny this application, it does not take away your ability to enforce a nuance if needed. You still have the authority. If there is chronic trespass, the police know how to handle that sort of thing. You have all of the resources to address the concerns that have been expressed.

Applicant had nothing more to add.

Close Public Hearing

Mayor Beebe closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Council Deliberations and Action

Mayor Beebe asked if the Council is under any obligation to make a decision tonight.

Ms. Wellington explained that we have until the last week in November and need time to write findings to submit.

Mr. Reid talked about the decision will be made tonight, with the findings to be presented and approved at the November 18th meeting.

Mayor Beebe said this is a hard one. He understands that we have a timeline. However without being able to ask BestCare questions, he isn't ready to make a decision. He doesn't see any accountability but realizes it has nothing to do with the housing application.

Councilor Howard said he doesn't like how this played out at all. The position we are in, is a position we cannot win. If we deny it will go to LUBA and will likely not win and cost a lot of money in legal fees. What this has done is open our code for changes, which we are doing. Whether or not we can keep up with state law is another thing because they change rapidly in this state. The only path he can support at this point is not to spend tax dollars. He doesn't like it, but sees no other way at this point.

Councilor Uffelman read his written statement into the record stating that he is ethically and morally responsible to protect this community. Councilor Uffelman highlighted his concerns about how this is being thrust upon us, not having a safe highway crossing, hopes that whoever funded this project, I hope they will see how this has created a safety hazard. As much he doesn't like it, has no other choice but to approve.

Councilor Smith agreed with both Councilors, but morally he doesn't like the idea of Salem legislators telling us how to develop our city. Talked about it being zoned C2 and should have been commercial businesses. He doesn't believe that the City of Prineville has the horsepower to change these laws in Salem. He took an oath to uphold the City and State laws, but in this case, he just can't.

Councilor Sumner talked about how we could pay the \$100,000 plus in legal fees and still end up with it after LUBA reviews. It is a land use issue that we have no control over it.

Discussions continued regarding it would change when someone sues BestCare and the board for approving this project, not knowing what there plan for management is, the treatment facility was once a successful restaurant, not seeing a reason to delay a decision.

Councilor Hutchison said that she agrees with the other Councilors. We are stuck between a rock and a hard place. Councilor Hutchison thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and speaking. Councilor Hutchison apologized that this probably will turn out the way anyone wanted.

Councilor Brummer said he thinks BestCare probably got this grant and had to spend it. He asked BestCare if they were still online to consider trading this property for the property adjacent to their treatment center. He doesn't like that the city has to make this decision. Councilor Brummer thanked all the folks who attended the meeting and all of their input.

Councilor Smith thanked Josh for all of his work on this.

Councilor Howard made a motion to approve Application-2025-100 for a 9-Unit Multifamily Complex presented by Best Care. Ms. Wellington recommended including that you do not find that the application triggers 197A.445 because some of the development is in the floodplain. Direct the applicant to write findings consistent with that and present to staff for their review by the 17th of November. Mr. Reid said that the staff would need the findings from the applicant before then, and if the Council is approving the application based on ORS 197A.400, objective standards, that is part of it. Also, finding that ORS 197A.445 and ORS 197A.460 do not apply, and then also making the rest of the **findings in the staff report. That**

would be the motion to approve and it is directing the applicant to present those findings to staff by November 14th, because it will be presented at the November 18th Council meeting.

Councilor Howard made the motion for approval of the application would be: pursuant to the findings in the staff report, which state that the application meets ORS 197A.400 and that the application does not meet ORS 197A.445 or ORS 197A.600. Council adopts the rest of the findings within the staff report and ask that the applicant present those findings to staff by November 14, 2025. Motion seconded. Discussion on motion included that this is approving the application, and the findings will be adopted at the November 18th Council meeting, and could only deny the findings if they were not consistent with the findings in the motion.

Adjourn

Councilor Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded. No discussion on the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 P.M.

Motions and Outcomes:

Motion:	Outcome	Beebe	Brummer	Howard	Hutchison	Smith	Sumner	Uffelman
Motion for approval of the application would be: pursuant to the findings in the staff report, which state that the application meets ORS 197A.400 and that the application does not meet ORS 197A.445 or ORS 197A.600. Council adopts the rest of the findings within the staff report and ask that the applicant present those findings to staff by November 14, 2025. Motion seconded. Discussion on motion included that this is approving the application, and the findings will be adopted at the November 18 th Council meeting, and could only deny the findings if they were not consistent with the findings in the motion.	PASSED	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Adjourn Meeting	PASSED	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Public Records Disclosure

Under the Oregon public records law, all meeting information, agenda packets, ordinances, resolutions, audio, and meeting briefs are available at the following URL:

<https://www.cityofprineville.com/meetings>.