

## MINUTES

Members Present: Chair Butler; Commissioners Chroust-Masin, Drabkin, Hall, Hillestad, Koch, Morgan, Stassens

Members Absent: Commissioner Tiedge

Staff Present: Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Pomeroy, Ms. Haines, Mr. Bisset, Ms. Kindel

### 1. Public Hearing (Quasi Judicial)

#### ◆ Docket CU 4-13

Request: Approval of a conditional use permit to allow for the construction of a public transportation passenger terminal in downtown McMinnville.

Location: 820 NE Second Street and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 9200, Section 21 BD, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., W.M.

Applicant: Mackenzie

Chair Butler called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., and opened the public hearing at 6:33 p.m. He requested disclosures, abstentions, or objections to jurisdiction. Commissioner Stassens stated that she had a commercial construction company that undertook projects similar to the one being proposed, and although the project was a potential conflict of interest, she did not have any conflict of interest with the project. Chair Butler stated that he had a potential conflict of interest because he was a bus driver employed by First Student Transportation which was a subsidiary of First America which was an owner of First Transit which operated under contract for Yamhill County. There were no disclosures from the other Commissioners present, and Chair Butler called for the staff report.

Mr. Pomeroy said the application request was to relocate the existing transit center from 5<sup>th</sup> Street to a location between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets east of the railroad tracks. He said that the location would be the first permanent home of Yamhill County Transit Authority's service that it had ever had, and noted buses would enter and exit from both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets. Mr. Pomeroy said that the application met all of the criteria for approval, and staff recommended approval subject to eight conditions.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin pointed out that the plan only showed one covered shelter for customers, and asked why there were not more.

Mr. Pomeroy said that some of the specific details in the site plan were conceptual; however, there was another conceptual sketch that would be part of the design review that showed three shelters.

Commissioner Stassens said that it appeared there were no provisions for off-street parking, and asked whether there were off-street parking requirements for such a facility.

Mr. Pomeroy said that the subject site was in a location where there were no off-street parking requirements.

Commissioner Drabkin noted the existence of landscaping on the western side of the subject site, and asked whether the applicants would be required to retain the larger trees.

Mr. Pomeroy explained that area was beyond the property line, and not part of the subject site.

Chair Butler called for applicant's testimony.

Christine McElvey, land use planner and architect with Mackenzie, said she was part of the team that had helped with the project. She responded to Commissioner Chroust-Masin's question about covered shelters, and said they planned to have three separate, detached covered areas, in addition to a covered bike parking area. Further, she said that the eaves of the building would extend at least three feet along all edges. Ms. McElvey said that they did not have the design fully developed at the time of the application submittal. She explained that the 1100 square foot building would house a couple of offices and a break area for the drivers, as well as a ticket window and some pedestrian amenities. As part of the grant process, she said an art installation would be put on the property as well. She said that everything on the existing site would be scraped and removed, and they would be treating all of the water on the impervious areas. With regard to trees, she said that there was one tree behind the existing building that would be removed, but there were no other trees that would be impacted.

Commissioner Stassens stated that she realized the subject site was selected as the best site, but asked how the site's shortcomings would be addressed, particularly the "park and ride" capacity.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin asked where the bus maintenance would be performed.

Tonya Saunders, Yamhill County Transit Area Transit Manager, said that adjacent empty parking lots would be used for park and ride, in particular some church parking lots in the area that were not in use during commute hours. She said churches were generally receptive to such an agreement. With regard to bus maintenance, she said that there was a location off of Lafayette Avenue where that would be done.

Commissioner Morgan asked whether Yamhill County Transit Authority had actively encouraged commercial bus service in McMinnville to tie into the project, since there was no outside bus service here.

Ms. Saunders said that was something they would not do. She informed the Planning Commissioners, however, that they connected with Tri Met in Tigard and Hillsboro and to the Max Line and Westrain. In addition, she said they connected to west Salem to Chariots Bus Service, and had service as far out as Grande Ronde, with service from Lincoln County that would connect with that service in the near future.

Commissioner Stassens asked whether a possible rail connection was still on the back burner, and whether any design alterations would have to be made on the transit center if that came into play in the future.

Ms. Saunders said she was certain they could make modifications and expand the facility in order to use it for passenger rail services if that ever happened.

There was no proponent's testimony, and Chair Butler called for opponent's testimony.

Tamara Chilla said she had lived on 1<sup>st</sup> and Irvine Streets for 13 years and it was a very high traffic area. She discussed the surrounding neighborhood and traffic and safety issues that currently existed there, and questioned whether there had been an evaluation of how the proposed facility would impact and exacerbate those issues. She also noted that there were a lot of transients in the area.

Tricia Bosko said she was also a resident of the neighborhood. She asked what the restroom would look like in the proposed facility, and said she also wanted to know about maintenance of the property and surveillance of the area once the building was completed.

Ms. McElvey said that a traffic study had not been required as part of the application. Although traffic was looked at, she said that the number of vehicle trips would be comprised primarily of the buses coming through. She said there weren't any other vehicle trips, so it wasn't a concern that warranted a traffic analysis at the time. Ms. McElvey said that part of the criteria in the comprehensive plan for approval of their application, were specific goals for bringing mass transit into the commercial district, and the location of the subject site would provide a good opportunity to meet that goal. She also pointed out that the majority of the property in the vicinity of the subject site was zoned commercial. In response to the question about the restroom facilities, she said that there would be two restrooms provided, which would be locked in the evening. She said the restrooms would be located in a well-lit, public area to provide as much security and prevent vandalism as much as possible. Ms. McElvey said that the building would be constructed of a vandal-resistant material, as well. She noted that there would also be security cameras installed, and there would be a maintenance plan for the building that would include a daily maintenance crew, as well as other staff on-site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hillestad, Ms. McElvey said that parking had not been a site consideration; rather, site selection had been an endeavor to find a site within the city where buses could come and the location would be suitable for moving passengers from the central city area.

With regard to concerns about transients in the neighborhood, Ms. McElvey reiterated that there would be a security system, which would include the installation of cameras, the site would be well-lit, the restroom facilities would be locked in the evening, and the facility would be staffed for most of the day. She said that it would be a law enforcement matter if it became an issue.

Chair Butler asked whether there was a sound barrier between the facility and the residence to the east.

Ms. McElvey said there would not be a sound barrier, but explained that the buses would only run for three minutes before automatically shutting off the engines.

Commissioner Morgan asked how late the buses would run in the evenings.

Ms. Saunders said buses would run until 9:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and until 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, with no bus service on Sunday.

Commissioner Stassens asked whether there would be any special precautions taken due to the proximity of the facility to the Head Start school across the street.

Ms. Saunders said that Head Start had been involved in the project from the onset of the study, and were supportive of it. She said they had addressed any concerns the school had, and noted they were going to incorporate the students into the development of some of the art for the project.

Ms. Chilla asked whether buses would travel through residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Saunders said each route would be different because the buses would be coming in from different areas of town, but that the buses would be traveling mainly on 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets.

Mr. Bisset explained that 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets were both identified as collectors in the city's adopted transportation system plan, and were intended to move traffic from one part of town to another. He said that there were projects in the city's capital plans for both streets to improve pedestrian crossings by adding "bulb outs" such as those on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, to shorten street crossing lengths; however, there was no available funding for the projects at this time. With regard to the subject site, Mr. Bisset said the site was zoned C-3, so any permitted commercial use could be constructed without any approval, and could have access to both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets. He pointed out that many of the permitted commercial uses would generate more site traffic than the transit function; which was why a traffic study had not been required.

There was no further testimony, and Chair Butler called for the public agency report.

Mr. Pomeroy said that only City Engineering and McMinnville Water and Light had responded with comments, which had been included in the staff report.

Chair Butler asked the applicant whether they were in opposition to any of the items in the staff report.

Ms. McElvey said they were fine with the conditions of approval, with the exception of condition number seven which dealt with the utility easement. She said that there was a conflict with the building design guidelines in the downtown district that required the building to be located right against the property line; however, they had a conflict with the location of the 10-foot utility easement because the building was six feet from the property line. She said they were working with Water and Light to resolve the issue.

The applicant waived the seven-day period allowed to submit final written arguments in support of the application.

Chair Butler closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Commissioner Chroust-Masin said the existing transit area at the courthouse became crowded at times, and a lot of people congregated there; which was not a good situation for individuals doing business at the courthouse. He said this was a good solution for the city; however, he expressed concern that as the city grew there would be a need for a larger facility. He also said he was concerned about the lack of public parking on-site, but beyond that, he was in favor of the application.

Commissioner Drabkin said she also had concerns about parking, but the application had met the criteria for parking. Therefore, she said the application was thorough and met all of the criteria for approval.

Commissioner Stassens said she liked the design and thought it was good the Yamhill County Transit Authority would have a permanent home. She echoed the concern about parking, but said the application had met all of the approval criteria.

Commissioners Hall, Morgan, and Koch expressed their support of the application.

Commissioner Hillestad also noted concerns about parking, but said he was thoroughly in favor of the concept, and believed it was the best location choice.

Chair Butler suggested an amendment to condition number seven, to include the words "or as may be approved by McMinnville Water & Light," so the entire condition would read "That 10-foot-wide public utility easements will be required along the site's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street frontages, 'or as may be approved' by McMinnville Water & Light."

Commissioner Stassens MOVED based on the findings of fact, the conclusionary findings for approval, and the material submitted by the applicant, to APPROVE CU 4-13, subject to the conditions as noted and amended in the staff report; SECONDED by Commissioner Chroust-Masin. Motion PASSED unanimously.

Chair Butler called for a recess at 7:21 p.m.

## **2. Work Session**

### **◆ Planning Commission Training / Discussion**

The Planning Commission reconvened at 7:31 p.m. in the Civic Hall Conference Room for the purpose of holding the first installment of an ongoing public work session addressing Planning Commission Training. Mr. Montgomery provided an overview of the format and topics to be covered. General discussion ensued regarding the purposes and form of staff reports, site visits, declarations of potential bias and/or conflicts of interest, and community outreach and education among other topics. The Chair continued the work session to the August 15, 2013, meeting. Additional work session topics will be discussed at future Planning Commission meetings as time permits.

## **3. Adjournment**

Chair Butler adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

---

Doug Montgomery  
Secretary