

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF DINNER MEETING
of the McMinnville City Council
Held at the Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, April 25, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Presiding: Scott A. Hill, Mayor

Recording: Melissa Grace, City Recorder

Councilors: Present Excused Absence
Remy Drabkin
Adam Garvin
Kevin Jeffries
Kellie Menke, Council President
Alan Ruden
Wendy Stassens

Also present were City Manager Jeff Towery, City Attorney David Koch, Community Development Director Mike Bisset, and Planning Director Heather Richards, members of the news media, Tom Henderson of the *News Register*, and Dave Adams of KLYC radio.

DINNER

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Hill called the Dinner Meeting to order at 6:24 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

DISCUSSION:

Mayor Hill asked for a volunteer to lead the Pledge of Allegiance and Councilor Ruden volunteered.

Mayor Hill reviewed the agenda for the evening.

Councilor Jeffries explained that Metro is now sending their garbage to Arlington realizing that it is harmful to the farmers. On May 18th they will be making a permanent decision. Councilor Jeffries presented the Councilors with a draft resolution regarding opposition of the expansion of Riverbend Landfill and a commitment to direct the disposal and hauling franchises of the City to

not send McMinnville's trash to Riverbend landfill once the transfer station is capable of taking the City's trash to an alternative landfill. Discussion ensued and no action was taken.

City Attorney Koch discussed ex-parte contacts in land use matters. He stated that they will be sitting in a quasi-judicial role for the Public Hearing. He noted that the Council must be impartial in rendering their decision. He reminded Council that decisions must be based on criteria and the record. He stated that Councilors must disclose any ex-parte contact. He stated that site visits must also be disclosed and if they had any thoughts from the visit, the Council must disclose. Discussion ensued regarding the importance of disclosure.

City Attorney Koch also explained that the public hearing is considered a "de novo" hearing and gives the applicant the right to submit new evidence and argument and raise new issues to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT: The Dinner Meeting was adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

s/s Melissa Grace
Melissa Grace, City Recorder

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
of the McMinnville City Council
Held at the Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, April 25, 2017, at 7:00 p.m.

Presiding: Scott A. Hill, Mayor

Recording: Melissa Grace, City Recorder

Councilors: Present Excused Absence
Remy Drabkin
Adam Garvin
Kevin Jeffries
Kellie Menke, Council President
Alan Ruden
Wendy Stassens

Also present were City Manager Jeff Towery, City Attorney David Koch, Community Development Director Mike Bisset, Police Chief Matt Scales, Planning Director Heather Richards, Senior Planner Ron Pomeroy, Associate Planner Chuck Darnell, Parks and Recreation Director Jay Pearson, and members of the news media, Tom Henderson of the *News Register*, and Dave Adams of KLYC radio.

AGENDA ITEM

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Hill called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Councilor Ruden led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. INVITATION TO CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: Mayor Hill invited the public to comment.

Brad Bassitt, McMinnville resident, wanted to discuss Systems Development Charges (SDC) waivers. He explained how SDC waivers worked in the Portland area which was a simple process and not a burden

on the City. He stated that it kept houses in a certain price range. This encouraged affordable housing and he thought something similar could be done in McMinnville. Councilor Drabkin discussed how the Affordable Housing Task Force was looking at a variety of methods and incentives.

4.

PROCLAMATIONS

a. Lemonade Day Proclamation

Mayor Hill presented a proclamation to Chamber representatives declaring May 6, 2017, as Lemonade Day.

Gioia Goodrum, Chamber President, shared that the program had been going on for three years and last year there were 172 participants from schools all over the area.

b. Construction Industry Safety Week Proclamation

Mayor Hill presented a proclamation to Al Arguedas, representative of the Safe Build Alliance declaring April 30 – May 6, 2017 as Construction Industry Safety Week. Mr. Arguedas shared the history of the Safety Alliance. The mission of the Safety Alliance is to make sure that every worker get home to their families safely every day.

c. Arbor Day Proclamation

Mayor Hill presented a proclamation to Associate Planner Chuck Darnell, declaring April 28, 2017, as Arbor Day. Jennifer Killian, representative from Oregon Community Trees was present and congratulated the City for their participation in Tree City USA and tree related activities in 2016. She explained the four standards of tree care that are required to be a Tree City USA. She presented the Tree City USA award to the City. Associate Planner Darnell said the City had been participating in this program for 20 years.

d. Historic Preservation Month Proclamation

Mayor Hill presented a proclamation to Associate Planner Darnell declaring May 2017 as Historic Preservation Month.

e. Child Abuse Prevention Month

Mayor Hill presented a proclamation to a representative of Juliette's House proclaiming April 2017 as National Child Abuse Prevention Awareness Month.

Representatives of Juliette’s House were present. They noted that they had been serving for 20 years in the community and that are many other agencies and individuals trying to protect children as well as donors and volunteers.

Mayor Hill noted that the Public Hearing (Agenda Item 5) was moved towards the end of the agenda.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

6.a. Consider the Minutes of the April 11, 2017 Dinner and Regular Meeting.

6.b. Request by The Mack Club (Fine Rock Grill) for a liquor license at 2223 NE McDaniel Lane.

Councilor Stassens MOVED to adopt the consent agenda; SECONDED by Councilor Ruden. Motion PASSED unanimously.

7. RESOLUTIONS

7.a. Resolution No. 2017-29: A Resolution awarding the contract for the OR 99W at 2nd St Signal Replacement Project, Project 2015-17.

Community Development Director Bisset referred Council to the staff report and resolution in the packet. He explained what was included in the project and that it was mostly funded by the transportation bond measure. The sewer work was funded by the wastewater capital funds and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was contributing half a million dollars for the replacement of the signals. Staff recommended approval of the Resolution to award the contract to Emery & Sons Construction Group in an amount \$1,699,995.00.

Councilor Stassens MOVED to adopt Resolution No. 2017-29 awarding the contract for the OR 99W at 2nd Signal Replacement Project, Project 2015-17; SECONDED by Council President Menke. Motion PASSED unanimously.

7.b. Resolution No. 2017-30: A Resolution awarding the contract for the 2017 Street Overlay Project, Project 2016-15.

Community Development Director Bisset stated that the resolution was related to the summer overlay project which was also funded through the transportation bond measure. This was the third year of the four year

overlay program. Twenty-one streets would be touched this summer and work would begin in June and end in September. Staff recommended approval of the Resolution to award the contract to Roy Houk Construction in an amount of \$1,240,854.40.

Councilor Jeffries MOVED to adopt Resolution No. 2017-30 awarding the contract for the 2017 Street Overlay Project, Project 2016-15; SECONDED by Councilor Garvin. Motion PASSED unanimously.

- 7.c. Resolution No. 2017-31: A Resolution awarding the contract for the design of the 12th Street Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project.

Community Development Director Bisset reminded Council that in February Council approved a short list of consultants to do the design work. Murray Smith and Associates was chosen. Their work would be completed this calendar year and construction would take place next calendar year.

Councilor Garvin MOVED to adopt Resolution No. 2017-31 awarding the contract for the design of the 12th Street Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project; SECONDED by Councilor Jeffries. Motion PASSED unanimously.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Ordinance No. 5021: An Ordinance Amending The Zoning Map Designation From EF- 80 (Exclusive Farm Use – 80-Acre Minimum) To R-1 PD (Single-Family Residential Planned Development) On Approximately 13.6 Acres Of Land, And From R-1 (Single Family Residential) To R-1 PD Single-Family Residential Planned Development) On Approximately 17.23 Acres Of Land, And Amending Planned Development Ordinance No. 4626 To Encompass An Additional 30.83 Acres Of Land To Allow Variation In Lot Sizes And Setback Requirement To Include: A Reduction In The Front Yard Setback For Certain Lots From 20 To 15 Feet; A Reduction In The Side Yard Setback For Certain Lots From 10 Feet To Either 7.5 Feet, 5 Feet Or 3 Feet; And A Reduction In The Exterior Side Yard Setback For Certain Lots From 20 Feet To 15 Feet.

AP 1-17

Mayor Hill read the public hearing statement and opened the public hearing at 7:47 p.m. He asked if there were any objections to Council's jurisdiction over hearing this matter.

Jeff Hayes, McMinnville resident, stated that the Hayes family sent a letter to the Council and that the timeline set by ORS 227.178 had passed which was acknowledged by staff in their letter dated November 16, 2016, and by Municipal Zoning Ordinance (MZO) 17-72-180 which clearly stated that the application must be filed within 15 calendar days of the mailing of the letter informing the applicant of the denial by the Planning Commission. He expressed his belief that the Planning Commission erred in allowing additional time to the applicant as the applicant did not have that ability. The applicant had an additional eight days beyond the 15 day timeframe. Mr. Hayes stated the MZO did not say the hearing was a de novo hearing and staff erred saying that it was. MZO 17-72-180 also stated the Council would receive a report and recommendation from the Planning Commission and this had not happened. Mr. Hayes stated that a new staff report was improper and should not be considered.

City Attorney Koch recommended that Council continue the public hearing after taking testimony so staff could consider the jurisdictional challenge prior to Council's decision.

Roger Goodwin, McMinnville resident, also challenged the jurisdiction of the City Council based on timeliness. He stated that the applicant surpassed the 15 days from the mailing of the decision to file the appeal. As such the Planning Commission's decision for denial was the end of the line.

Planning Director Richards explained the timeframe. The decision was made on February 16, 2017, and the notice was to be mailed within five working days. Because of President's Day on February 21, the notice was mailed on February 24, which met the five working days requirement. The applicant had 15 calendar days to submit an appeal, however per the zoning ordinance if it fell on a weekend day they had until Monday. In this case the 15 calendar days was March 11, which was a Saturday, and they had until March 13 to submit the appeal.

Mr. Hayes stated that he believed the 15th day should be March 10.

Mayor Hill asked if Council would like to make any disclosures or abstentions on this application.

Councilor Ruden disclosed a telephone call one and a half years ago to the applicant's office. He also mentioned that approximately four months ago someone from his office contacted the applicant's office about the neighborhood as they were neighbors. He did not have a bias.

City Attorney Koch asked Councilor Ruden if there was any information Councilor Ruden gained from these conversations that would affect his decision. Councilor Ruden stated there was none.

Mayor Hill asked if Council would like to declare any contacts or sources of information outside of staff regarding this application.

Councilor Ruden declared that he received notice as a neighbor.

Council President Menke stated she had read an article in the *News Register*. She also noted that she discussed the application with the City Planner in front of citizens tonight.

Councilor Jeffries disclosed an ex-parte contact with Steve Patterson who sat on the Board of Directors for the Country Club. Mr. Patterson mentioned he was not aware of the applicant approaching Michaelbook although this property was adjacent to the golf course.

The Mayor asked if any Councilors had visited the site.

The Mayor disclosed that he visited the site and looked at the fence. He thought the fence protected the property and hid the homes.

Planning Director Richards and Principal Planner Ron Pomeroy provided the staff report. Planning Director Richards stated that the Council's consideration was if the applicant's appeal had merit, meaning did it meet the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. If it did, then Ordinance No. 5021 was the tool to enact the decision in support of the applicant. If it did not, then the Council should vote to deny the appeal. Staff thought the application met the

policies and criteria of the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and recommended approval.

Staff would be providing a brief summary of the process thus far, the application and the nuances associated with the Planning Commission denial and the staff recommendation of approval. Ms. Richards provided a summary of the record:

- Attachment A: Ordinance No. 5021
- Exhibit A: Decision Document
- Attachment 1 – Application
- Attachment 2 – Application Supplemental Materials (Exhibits A-P)
- Attachment 3 – Public Notices
- Attachment 4 – Testimony Received for the Appeal
- Attachment 5 – McMinnville Staff Report, CC 04.25.17
- Attachment 6 – Decision Letter from the PC
- Attachment 7 – McMinnville Ordinance No. 4626
- Attachment 8 – Public Testimony Received at the PC Level
- Attachment B: PC Staff Report, 02.16.17
- Attachment C: PC Minutes, 02.16.17

Planning Director Richards gave a project summary including the site location bounded by Hill Road and Baker Creek Road and two requested zone changes. One zone change was to go from EF-80 which encompassed 13.6 acres to R-1 PD and the other zone change was from R-1 to R-1 PD. The existing planned development was 26.65 acres that was adopted in 1996. Half of that property had not been developed. The applicant wanted to bring in an additional 7.82 acres from the west and 23.01 acres from the east to the planned development which would create a total planned development area of 57.48 acres. The new planned development would include: 335 dwelling units, 71% detached SFDU, 7.8% attached Single-family dwelling units (SFDU), and 20.9% multi-family for an average of 5.82 units per acre. The proposed subdivision plan of 44.36 acres was reviewed and included: a 3.8 acre C3-PD multi-family, 208 SFDU for 5.13 units per acre, 70 Multi-family dwelling units (MFDU) for 18.42 units/ acre. This would be built out in four phases over 5 years.

Planning Director Richards displayed a table of the proposed development standards and five variances of lot sizes. She stated that the minimum lot size was 3,200 square feet and the largest was 9,000 square feet. She displayed a graphic of the proposed development

reflecting the lot sizes. She noted the larger lots were in Baker Creek East and the smaller lots were in Baker Creek West.

There were other subdivisions in McMinnville where these kinds of interior side yard setbacks could be found. Planning Director Richards reviewed the various similar local developments with a 6 foot and 5 foot side yards and lot widths of 20 to 36 feet. She then showed a product in Sherwood that was similar to the proposal. These products were being built all around Oregon including rural areas.

Baker Creek East would include 23.01 acres, 83 SFDU and 3.6 units per Acre (low density). The average lot size would be 8,567 square feet. There would be an active open space of 7,934 square feet and two walkways for connectivity. This project would be completed in two phases.

Baker Creek West would include 21.35 acres, 125 SFDU and 7.12 units per acre (Medium Density). The average lot size would be 3,642 square feet. There was one lot that would be built as a multi-family complex. It would have 70 MFDU and 18.42 units per acre (High Density). The active open space was 29,000 square feet and there would be two walkways for connectivity. There would be two private parks built by the developer and transferred to the Homeowners Association (HOA). This development would be completed in two phases as well.

Planning Director Richards summarized the overall proposed amended planned development, which would include 57.48 acres total with five different lot sizes, 335 DU (265 single family dwelling units/70 multi-family dwelling units) with a density of 5.8 units/ acre, open space of 5.29 acres or 9.23% of the planned development, and active open space of 4.28 acres or 7.4% of the planned development.

The Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend denial to the City Council on February 16, 2017. They conducted a public hearing on January 19, 2017. They closed the public hearing but kept the hearing open until February 2, 2017, and deliberated and made a decision on February 16. In their motion to recommend denial they did not provide specific findings for the denial. However, they all provided individual statements as part of the deliberation. Those clearly in

opposition alluded to the purpose statement of Planned Developments in the Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.51.010 as the basis for their opposition.

A summary of the individual concerns raised by some of the Planning Commission were as follows:

- Not enough multi-family units.
- Not enough open space.
- Concern about on-street parking and compact urban form.
- Did not provide enough quality design (urban form, open space) for flexibility requested as part of the planned development.
- Concern about the 3 foot yard setbacks.

On February 24, 2017, a decision letter was provided indicating the developers should use a creative approach and facilitate a desirable aesthetic and efficient use of open space and create public and private common open spaces. The applicant appealed the decision on March 13, 2017. The McMinnville Zoning Ordinance was not clear on whether or not the appeal was a de novo hearing, but after legal counsel review, it was determined that it was.

City Attorney Koch noted that the calculation for the 15 days began on February 24, 2017 when the letter was sent out to Saturday, March 11, 2017. That was consistent with how the City provided the calculation of dates in the Municipal Code.

Planning Director Richards stated that there were two minor revisions to the proposal: one was added active open space to Baker Creek West (21,500 sf), eliminating five lots, and the other was adding five units to the multi-family complex (65 units to 70 units).

Staff recommended approval with the drafted conditions of approval to the Planning Commission and still recommended approval with the drafted conditions of approval to the City Council because it met the Comprehensive Plan policies and goals and the code criteria in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff understood the Planning Commission and the opposition public testimony concerns and anxiety regarding high density SFD development which was new for McMinnville. Staff also understood the enduring value and “The Third Generation Test.”

Ms. Richards reviewed portions of the Comprehensive Plan:

Chapter V: Housing and Residential Development: Goal 1. To promote development of affordable, quality housing for all City residents, and Goal 2. To promote a residential development pattern that was land intensive and energy efficient, that provided for an urban level of public and private services, and that allowed unique and innovative development techniques to be employed in residential designs.

Policy 59.00 – Opportunities for multiple-family and mobile home developments shall be provided in McMinnville to encourage lower-cost renter and owner-occupied housing. Such housing shall be located and developed according to the residential policies in this plan and the land development regulations of the City.

Goal #2: Housing – To promote land development of affordable, quality housing for all city residents.

Policy 71.13- Factors that help guide location of High density residential include:

- Direct access to a major collector or arterial street.
- No development limitations.
- Can be buffered from low-density residential.
- Adjacent to a public park.
- Within a half mile of an existing or planned public transit route.
- Areas within a quarter mile of commercial services.
- Facilities have adequate capacity for additional development.

Planning Director Richards stated the area had direct access to a minor arterial, Hill Road. It was within a half mile of an existing or planned transit route. A McMinnville Transit Feasibility Study was being conducted for the area. There was planned commercial north of Baker Road per the Comprehensive Plan. There was concern at the Planning Commission meeting that there were not adequate facilities for additional development, however the City's public facility plans had considered the needed improvements and funding those improvements for this area. Regarding buffers from low density residential, the Baker Creek East portion was low density and mirrored what was built around it. The higher density piece was buffered from low density by large public open space, a future school site, two minor arterials, and duplexes that showed a transition of density. It was supposed to be adjacent to a public park, and there was a planned future park of 5.7 acres adjacent to the bike and pedestrian path.

Policy 71.01- Residential land in west McMinnville is limited to an average of 6 Dwelling Units per acre except land within ¼ mile of transit

routes where higher density should be encouraged. “In order to provide higher density housing on the west side, density allowances or trade-offs shall be allowed and encouraged.” The amended planned development was 5.82 units per acre.

Policy 71.09 – Majority of land in McMinnville is intended to develop at Medium Density (4-8 units/ acre), including small lot single-family detached uses, and should be directed to areas with:

- Direct access from collector or arterial streets.
- Adequate service from existing facilities.
- Access to public transit within a quarter mile.
- Not geographically constrained.
- Buffered from low-density residential development.

Baker Creek East was 7.12 units per acre which was a medium density qualification.

Policy 71.06 – Low Density Residential Development (3-4 units/ acre) should be limited to:

- Land shown as Developed low density on buildable lands inventory
- Areas with only collector and local streets
- Areas with geographical constraints

Baker Creek East was 3.6 units per acre.

For Density, Policy 71.01 and Policy 79.00 applied:

Policy 71.01 – Residential land in west McMinnville is limited to an average of 6 DU per acre except land within a quarter mile of transit routes where higher density should be encouraged.

Policy 79.00 – Densities greater than those allowed by the zoning classification may be allowed through the planned development process.

Ms. Richards then reviewed the second legal test in regard to meeting the Zoning Ordinance: Zone Change: Section 17.74.020: Needs to demonstrate the following:

- Consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Orderly and timely, considers the patten of development in the area and surrounding land uses.
- Able to be effectively served with municipal utilities and services.

Planned Development: Section 17.51.010 (A): Needs to be carried out in accordance with 17.51.030, and accomplish substantially the same general objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Section 17.51.020

A. Principal use shall reflect the use on the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map.

B. Density for residential planned development shall be determined by the underlying zone designation.

Planning Director Richards reviewed the other tests related to planned developments including Section 17.51.030 (C) and Section 17.74.070. Other criteria in the Zoning Ordinance included: Parking – 2 spaces per SFDU of four bedrooms or less; Sewer, Water, and Transportation Infrastructure – adequate to serve the development; and Parks – Every residence within half a mile of a neighborhood park. There would be a barrier-free park of 5.7 acres off of Yohn Ranch Drive.

Mayor Hill asked if there was money in the budget for that park. Planning Director Richards confirmed that was correct as it was being built in collaboration with the developer.

Planning Director Richards reviewed the written public testimony that had been received. It generally spoke to concerns regarding: increased density equaling decreased neighborhood livability; whether public utilities and services could accommodate the expected service loads; whether there would be adequate pedestrian connections and convenient access to parks; and the cost of community services such as police and fire. In terms of the conditions of approval, there were 44. Condition #2 limited the C-3 PD to 70 units, 35 foot maximum height, and design standards. She shared pictures that showed what that height would look like from the road. Staff also wanted to ensure that there was additional, quality, active open space in the higher density neighborhood and Condition #4 required three active open space areas in Baker Creek West to be built by the applicant and maintained by the HOA. A recommended amended to that condition was that Tract C and D of Baker Creek West and Active Area A of Baker Creek East be turf open spaces with some amenities and that the Detention Areas be landscaped. The final designs would be approved by the Landscape Review Committee.

Planning Director Richards stated to mitigate the concern regarding producing a cookie-cutter neighborhood, the following conditions were included: No same home design shall be built in adjacency to another including both sides of the street (Condition #6), That 25% of the lots shall be offered at fair market value for six months following preliminary plat approval (or should it be final plat recording) to outside developers and builders (Condition #26), and Architectural Plan Book needed to be provided and approved (Condition #5). The Applicant would be required to submit a “pattern book” for residential design addressing:

- Quality and Type of exterior materials.
- Front porches and entry areas.
- Sample exterior colors.
- Residential style and massing.
- Roof design and materials.
- Exterior doors and windows.
- Garage door types.

Planning Director Richards noted clerical errors in the packet: the open space in Tract C in Baker Creek West should be 11,393 square feet (Condition #4) and the front yard setback should be 15 feet not 20 feet (Condition #3). She concluded that staff recommended approval of the Ordinance with the conditions of approval.

Councilor Drabkin asked staff if there was a formula to determine the correct amount of open space. Planning Director Richards replied there was not a formula in the code, but it was recommended in the future code amendments. There was a formula established by state law that only allowed the amount of open space to be proportional to the land development proposal. This application had more open space than past developments.

Councilor Drabkin asked about wetland protection. Principal Planner Pomeroy stated the City tried to preserve wetlands whenever possible. If a wetland was suspected or known, then an assessment would be conducted by the Division of State Lands. If it needed to be protected then it must be fenced off and preserved. A developer could mitigate a wetland off-site by building a new one or enhancing an existing wetland in the same or another basin. A wetland assessment would be required per Condition #27.

Councilor Ruden noted that it was great to see this property for its highest and best use. He asked about the thought process regarding the reduction

of lot sizes on the 23.01 acres. Planning Director Richards explained that the formula created these lot sizes to achieve the needed densities. Baker Creek came in with a proposal and staff noted that it fit into a variety of the policies.

Councilor Stassens asked how adding land to a planned development worked and how it impacted the existing planned development. Planning Director Richards noted that Ordinance No. 4626 created the existing planned development. Staff recommended repealing Ordinance 4626 and all the elements that still applied to the planned development as well as the conditions they wanted to carry forward would be included in the new ordinance.

Councilor Stassens asked Planning Director Richards to explain the density trade-offs. Planning Director Richards clarified that in order to create a valuable, livable neighborhood there needed to be trade-offs such as additional open space or innovative design to be able to achieve the density required but still have private walls. It allowed those elements to happen.

Councilor Jeffries asked about the multi-family location. Planning Director Richards noted that the lot had been identified, but they did not need to provide a site plan yet. There was a condition of approval that included design standards for the multi-family development.

Discussion ensued regarding multi-family units allowed in a C-3 PD zone.

Councilor Jeffries expressed concern that there was only one entrance off of Hill Road to the development. He was also concerned regarding the volume of traffic during peak times onto Hill Road. Planning Director Richards explained that many access points on minor arterials were discouraged. The intersection would be built to accommodate the extra traffic. The Transportation System Plan had taken this development into account.

Community Development Director Bisset stated that a traffic study was done for full development of this area to this level of density including the development of the elementary and high school sites and projected traffic volumes to 2035. Per the traffic analysis, both corridors would perform at a high level of service and the key intersections would operate safely. For

the intersection of Hill and 2nd, at year 2035 a traffic signal or a round about would have to be installed. Planning Director Richards explained how Hill Road was being developed and how it would look more like Baker Creek in how it accommodated traffic with additional bicycle and pedestrian amenities.

Councilor Jeffries was skeptical as he did not see it as a safe solution moving forward.

Mayor Hill announced that Council would recess for a short break at 9:25 p.m. The public hearing resumed at 9:37 p.m.

Applicant: Gordon Root stated that Stafford Development Company, LLC was both a partner and manager of Baker Creek Development, LLC, the applicant. The principals were Gordon Root and Rick Waible. The project manager was Morgan Will. Stafford Development was a local developer and home builder with 23 employees. They focused on smaller communities such as: McMinnville, Dundee, Forest Grove, Scappose, Silverton, Woodburn, Molalla, Canby and Dallas. They strove to deliver the A, B, C's of housing, affordability, balance, and choice.

Baker Creek Development, LLC was the applicant/owner. Mr. Root shared the names of the project team. They built a diversity of housing types and lot sizes, they had an innovative approach to small lot development, they focused on building "high performance homes," and they were predominantly "SPEC" home builders. He noted they were multiple awarding winning builders, such as the Street of Dreams in 2016. They sold the majority of the lots they developed, they took a long term approach to the marketplace, and wanted to be a good corporate citizen. They planned to work with the City on street improvements and creating park and open space.

Morgan Will of Stafford Development displayed the proposed development which showed the existing C-3 PD portion. The northern area had an existing R-1 overlay that was approved under Ordinance 4626. It was the area they were requesting to amend. There was a remnant of County zoning in the southern area and their intent was to change it to R-1 PD. To the east were 57 detached single family homes and duplex town homes already built out and the western area of the site was left unbuilt. The amendment to the plan included adding land. A new overlay would be

put on the unbuilt portions of the planned development. The amended planned development overlay created no change to the existing built areas, it met the Ordinance 4626 requirement that the C-3 PD portion of the site be developed with multi-family dwellings, it allowed flexibility in block dimensions to preserve and protect existing natural features, and it allowed variation from the underlying zoning district in three ways, side setbacks, front setbacks, and lot area. He continued by describing the five proposed typical lot types. For the SFD 70, no variations were being requested. They would be standard R-1 zone lots with 10 foot side yard setbacks, 20 foot street, garage, and rear setbacks, and 9,000 square foot minimum lot area. For the SFD 65, they were requesting flexibility to allow the lots to have 7.5 foot side yard setbacks and greater than 6,500 square foot average lot area. They would have up to a 50 foot wide dwelling, a minimum of four off-street parking spaces, and all other dimensions met R-1 standards. For the SFD 60, the variance requested was to have a 5 foot side setback, 15 foot front building setback, and greater than 6,000 square foot average lot area. They would have up to a 50 foot wide dwelling, a minimum of four off-street parking spaces, and all other dimensions met R-1 standards. For SFD 40, the requested variance was for 5 foot side setbacks, 15 foot front and street side setbacks, and 4,000 square foot minimum lot area. These lots would accommodate a typical 30 foot wide dwelling and would have a minimum of four off-street parking spaces. For SFD 32, the lots would be interspersed with SFD 40 so that there would be 8 feet between buildings. The variance would be for a 3 foot side setback, 15 foot front and street side setback, and 3,200 square foot minimum lot area. The lots would allow for a typical 26 foot wide dwelling with a minimum of four off-street parking spaces.

The functionality and benefits of side yards was discussed. Mr. Root clarified these were detached town homes that owners could walk all the way around and windows were on all four sides and they did not share a wall with their neighbor. They had an open floor plan. While they sacrificed side yard, they had not sacrificed the depth of the back yard. They planned to put rocks on the side yard to help with maintenance. The garbage and recycling bins could go in the side yard and be out of site.

Driveway depth was also discussed. Mr. Root said the driveway depth met the R-1 standard, which was 20 feet from the garage door to the front property line. They were full size driveways. He explained how they were pairing the driveways to create spaces for on-street parking.

Discussion ensued regarding the minimal use of finite fuels and raw materials as well as energy efficiencies. Mr. Will explained that they were meeting the housing goals of more homes in less land and more homes using less raw materials. Mr. Root stated they would be selling most of the lots and could not dictate what other people would build. Energy efficiency standards were becoming the norm. Customers were asking for that and builders were responding. A new home was generally lower in cost for heating, cooling, and maintenance. The smaller lots and homes were more energy efficient.

Mr. Will said 83 units were planning to be built for Baker Creek East which would be larger lots and 125 units for Baker Creek West which would be smaller lots.

Councilor Ruden asked about using alleys for parking instead as there would be many driveway cuts and concrete driveways. If there were alleys, street trees could be put in and it would be a more livable street. He thought the streetscape proposed was a negative to the project. Mr. Root thought that front-loaded homes were more family friendly. He had built at a much higher density than this and there was a need for this type of housing. It was what the market was demanding. There would be 8 foot spacing between the smaller homes and there would be off-street parking. He would put in as many street trees as possible.

Proposed street tree locations were discussed. The applicant was targeting one street tree per lot. It was noted that one of the conditions was for approval of the landscape plan by the Landscape Review Committee.

Pricing of the lots and homes were discussed. The lowest price point would be about \$240,000. Housing affordability was discussed.

Mr. Will continued by explaining the extension of stubbed streets including Shadden Drive, 23rd Street, and Yohn Ranch Drive as well as a network of new internal local streets.

Mr. Root reviewed the planned development approval criteria. The planned development objectives were housing affordability, diversity, and variety; focus on detached single family housing type; open space amenities; off-street parking, avoid “cookie cutter” housing; appropriate

transition of housing density; and preserve and incorporate natural amenities into the design.

Andrew Stamp, Land Use Attorney, reviewed the planned development objective of providing affordability, diversity, and variety and the Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing). Goal 10 stated, "...plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing unit at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density...". For this project they were looking at the financial capability of the people of McMinnville and were trying to tailor the housing types to the needs of the community. They were defining affordable housing as spending no more than 30% of gross household income. And if more than 30% was being spent, it was considered a house burden. McMinnville had the highest percentage of cost burdened residents in Yamhill County. There was a high demand for homes in McMinnville, but the median home prices were rising faster than incomes. This was a danger sign for the community and there needed to be more inventory to meet the demand. This application would help to decrease the gap. Once land was in the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), it needed to be available to be developed. The R-1 conforming lots were not very affordable. By creating many different lot sizes, the development would be appealing to the broadest possible range of home buyers. They were seeking the flexibility referenced in Goal 10 to develop a diverse variety of homes commensurate with local incomes. The median price on the market currently was \$400,000 which was only affordable to a small percentage of McMinnville residents. Their goal was to be significantly lower than that. Diversity and variety allowed people to move upward and downward on the housing spectrum while staying in the same community with their friends and neighbors. It was important to note that the development costs for the site were fixed and the more homes that could be accommodated in that space would help reduce the overall development costs. He discussed the consequences to the prices based on the increased open space that was suggested by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Root highlighted their focus on detached single family housing types. The Metro Residential Housing Preference Study showed 80% of people preferred detached single family homes and 7% indicated a preference for attached dwellings. Even though the homes were eight feet apart, they could not hear their neighbors, there were windows on all sides with light

coming in, people could walk all the way around their homes, and it was the desired housing type. The existing planned development created 54% detached single family homes and 46% attached duplexes/townhomes, and the amended planned development created 71.3% detached single family homes, 7.8% attached duplexes/townhomes, and 20% multi-family homes.

Mr. Will discussed open space amenities. They met with the Parks Department regarding the proposed future park. Originally they thought the open space in Baker Creek East would be sufficient. The Planning Commission thought Baker Creek West needed more open space. The amended plan proposed not building on two lots and using the 10,000 square feet for open space. It would be an open field for active play on Montgomery Drive. There would also be a path on the boundary with the school property to encourage walking. For Baker Creek West 2nd phase there would be a 7,500 square foot “tot lot” with playground, bench, and picnic table on Haun Drive and there would also be 11,000 square feet of active open field space. There would be a walking path on Haun Drive to Baker Creek Road to encourage walking and for future transit connections. In the Baker Creek East 1st phase there would be an 11,000 square foot tract with walkway and tree grove at Shadden to Victoria. There would also be 8,000 square feet of active open space and 16,000 square feet for a detention pond. In the Baker Creek East 2nd phase, there would be a 3,500 square foot walkway connecting Snowberry and McGarey Drive and would be adjacent to over 55,000 square feet of passive open space and natural area.

Mr. Root said regarding adequate off street parking, Code Section 17.60.060 (A)(5) required two off-street parking spaces per unit. They proposed four off-street parking spaces and with pairing the driveways, all single family homes would have more than one on-street parking space per lot. This gave them over 5 parking spaces per home. In summary, there would be 208 new detached single family homes. They were required to have 416 off-street spaces by Code and were proposing 832 off-street spaces as well as 305 on-street spaces for a total of 1,137 new parking spaces.

Mr. Root addressed the way they were avoiding “cookie cutter housing.” This would be done by a variation in lot size and side setbacks, providing not just one type of home, and a variation in size, massing and spacing. There would be a minimum of fifteen different plans for Baker Creek

West. There would also be a variety of building facades and lots would be made available to other builders. He noted that a 15 foot front yard setback allowed for some flexibility with design and variety in the streetscape. It also allowed everyone to have a front porch.

Mr. Will discussed the housing density transition which would match the existing patterns of zoning.

Discussion ensued regarding lot reservations and when the six month period would begin. Councilor Ruden thought instead of the six month period beginning at preliminary plat approval, it should begin at the recording of the plat. Mr. Root wanted to put in phase 1 and phase 2 this construction season. He agreed preliminary plat approval was nebulous, but recording of the plat might take until next year. Builders wanted the ability to pull a building permit at the plat report. He suggested that the six month period begin at the commencement of site development which was about four months from now.

Councilor Ruden still thought it should start at the recording of the plat. Mr. Root agreed that 25% of the lots would be held back until the recording of the plat.

Mr. Will continued explaining the housing density transition including the east to west pattern of large lots to the east and medium lots to duplex/townhomes in the west. The multi-family would be in the west next to school, park, and commercial sites. Another objective was protecting natural features and incorporating them into the design. They would be avoiding wetland impacts with cul-de-sacs and modified blocks and they would protect the features in open space tracts and conservation easements. He noted that 100% of the wetlands would be maintained and protected.

Mr. Stamp stated that there were a lot of competing goals and policies and they were trying to find a balance to integrate this new development into an existing community. He thought this was the best plan for this development. As the staff report concluded, the application met the criteria. The Planning Commission had denied the application and requested more open space and connectivity and they had made those changes. The Commission relied on a purpose statement as the basis for denial, and LUBA stated purpose statements should not be used for that

purpose. He read an editorial from the *News Register* regarding how open space was nice but it came at a price and how smaller lots and higher densities represented the only way single family housing could be made affordable. He requested approval of the application.

Council President Menke stepped out of the room at 11:15 p.m. and returned at 11:16 p.m.

Councilor Drabkin responded to the editorial by noting that smaller lots and higher densities did not mean the housing would be more affordable. House prices were on the rise and she was concerned that the intention of creating affordable housing would not be the end result. There was no promise that a certain percentage would be kept at the affordable housing rate. She asked if there was a way to guarantee that the SFD 32 homes would be affordable.

Discussion ensued regarding workforce housing. Mayor Hill thought this application would address that need.

Councilor Garvin questioned that this was affordable. It was market competitive, but not affordable. Mr. Root agreed this was workforce housing. Those who were currently renting and bought one of these homes would make that rental available for someone else.

Proponents:

Mark Davis, McMinnville resident, was not a fan of the planned development process. He thought there needed to be more land brought in to the UGB and that land should be given the correct zoning. He was supporting this because this was the only way to get multi-family development in the community. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan called for spreading affordable housing around the community. Those policies were 61, 67, 84, and 86. He also referenced the Economic Opportunities Analysis which was completed in November 2013 and Figure 8 on Page 15 that covered employment in 2010. In 2010 there were 13,383 jobs and of those jobs 2,933 were in the retail and dining sector with an average annual income of \$21,202. There were another 4,320 jobs in the services sector with an average annual income of \$34,274. That was 56% of the jobs in the community. Salaries had increased since then, but so had housing prices. There was a need for more affordable housing and

affordable rentals. People who had jobs in the City should be able to live in the City.

David Hahn, McMinnville resident, said this was a quasi-judicial decision. The Planning Commission hearing included what people thought about the application, but there were rules that the Council had to follow. He encouraged them to vote according to the rules. They had a planning staff that had spent many hours putting this together and had worked with the applicant. He thought the Council should rely on what the professionals said, which was to approve the application. Regarding affordable housing, the RMLS in McMinnville listed zero building sites under \$100,000. They needed more developments like this one.

Opponents:

Roger Goodwin, McMinnville resident, did not think the application met the mutually beneficial relationship criteria to the existing Shadden Claim development. In order to meet the density levels, they were using the Shadden Claim development which had a lower density to get to the less than six threshold. Some of the lot sizes on the maps were inaccurate to the existing Shadden Claim. He did not see how the variances requested alleviated a hardship. Traffic flow would be a problem, especially for the multi-family, as there was no easy access to Hill or Baker Creek. They would have to go through the neighborhood and he suggested putting in more accesses. He did not think there would be enough parking. He read the approval criteria for the variances and discussed how he did not think the application met the criteria. The project would lower property values. A lot of the proposed open space was not usable. He did not think there were special physical conditions or objectives that existed to warrant a departure from the standard requirements. He thought the homes on the smaller lots would be too close together. Most of these homes would become rentals and he thought it missed the mark for diversity. They didn't know how the development would look in the end if the applicant was only going to develop 20% of the lots. The apartment building would be too congested for the neighborhood. He recommended denial of the application.

Jeff Hayes, McMinnville resident, stated under ORS 227.178, this hearing was improper. The staff report stated the time for approval ended on March 28, 2017. According to the ORS, the time for approval, including

the resolution of all appeals, ended on that date. He thought it was improper to be holding this public hearing based on that.

City Attorney Koch explained that statutory provision created a deadline for the City to take action on the application and it was the developer's right to enforce it. It did not preclude holding a hearing tonight.

Mr. Hayes thought the City's legal counsel was mistaken. The original application should not be considered as one proposal. It was two distinct developments within two distinct areas. The applicant was seeking different modifications to the overall zoning. The two areas were not connected and there was no reason to consider them as one. Staff stated in the background information that these applications (plural) were submitted as one overall package and staff repeatedly referred to two areas. The only reason to combine them was for the applicant to manipulate the density to achieve a unit number goal. There were no CC&R's presented for approval. He questioned the wetlands survey as there was no flow of Baker Creek included. He was not opposed to development, however the concerns had not been alleviated, this was too much density and traffic for the area, and it would affect livability.

Principal Planner Pomeroy confirmed Baker Creek East and Baker Creek West were joined by Shadden Claim first addition. Since it was contiguous, the applicant was able to proceed with one proposal. Regarding density, in all planned developments the density was averaged regardless of the shape of the planned development. In this case, part of the planned development area was developed years ago. They were growing the size of the area by adding more land which allowed for density averaging. It made sense logically to discuss this in two different pieces because they were at opposite ends of this contiguous shape and they had different characteristics.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Stamp confirmed that the City Attorney correctly advised the Council on the procedural matters for ORS 227.178. The 120 days could be extended and the applicant agreed to whatever extension the Council needed. Contiguous meant joining at one point even if it was less than one foot, and in this instance there was much more than that. Regarding hardship for the variances, that was not appropriate here because they

were not seeking a variance in the traditional section of the code that dealt with variances. They were seeking a deviation from the normal R-1 standards and the points they raised warranted not applying the traditional 9,000 square foot lot size. If all of these lots were 9,000 square feet, there would not be as many buyers for them. The City needed workforce housing. Regarding the traffic, it was general transportation planning that arterials did not have many connection points because they created conflicts. It was a better situation for people to experience some congestion than having several car crashes on the arterial. He asked for approval of the ordinance.

Mr. Root said Baker Creek was on the far north of Baker Creek Road and was not part of this application.

There was discussion regarding continuing the hearing due to the late hour and to allow citizens to testify who had to leave the meeting early.

Mr. Stamp said it was the applicant's preference for the hearing to be closed and a decision made that night as he was up against a deadline to get going in this building season.

City Attorney Koch said if the Council thought there was testimony that had not been heard yet that would weigh on the Council's decision, they should continue the hearing. Otherwise he advised them to close the hearing.

Councilors Menke and Stassens thought there had been enough opportunity for citizens to provide testimony and thought the hearing should be closed.

Councilor Drabkin was not clear if this would achieve affordable or workforce housing. She thought it was not a good idea to make a decision after midnight.

Council President Menke thought it was workforce housing, not affordable housing.

By majority consensus, Mayor Hill closed the public hearing.

Deliberations:

Councilor Drabkin expressed concern regarding the numbers and whether or not the increased density would translate to affordable/workforce housing. She would like the additional housing as there was a need for it, but there was not a way to hold the applicant accountable after approval to guarantee that workforce housing.

Councilor Ruden agreed the City needed this project. He liked most of the project, but had concerns about the density of Baker Creek West and the livability of that neighborhood. He appreciated the open spaces recommended by the Planning Commission. He thanked the applicant for adjusting the six month period. He thought the criteria had been met. He suggested increasing the lot sizes of Baker Creek West by eliminating the SFD 32 lots and making them SFD 40 lots. It was a large compact area with close concrete driveways and by making the lots larger the streetscape could be improved and the traffic and noise could be cut down. He did not have an issue with the requested setbacks.

Councilor Jeffries did not have reservations about the traffic flow. He thought it would be resolved as needed. He appreciated the desire to do in-fill here and he thought it was the right place for this type of development. He was also concerned that it would not hit the price point to make the homes affordable. He did not want to lose the opportunities to solve the affordable housing problem and shared Councilor Drabkin's concerns. He hoped that having this volume of dwellings would lower the price of homes. He was also concerned about the livability of the neighborhood and the number of driveways.

Councilor Stassens said they did not have affordable lots or affordable houses in the City. Whether it was workforce housing or affordable housing, it was all needed. The location was good and she thought it met the criteria. The only criterion she wanted to hear more about was the special physical conditions or objectives, and she thought the planning staff and applicant presentations explained the need for this housing and that it was a new type of housing that would be at a lower price point. She thought it would be a nice aesthetic and they had to follow the design standards. She was in support.

Discussion ensued regarding establishing a local Homeowners Association for this project. City Attorney Koch said establishing an HOA was in the

conditions of approval through the CC&R's. The CC&R's would have to be submitted to the City for approval prior to the final plat being recorded.

Councilor Garvin had reservations about the density in Baker Creek West. He thought the criteria had been met and had merit to move forward. He did not think the SFD 32 lots would be affordable housing and thought they should all be SFD 40 lots to create a better streetscape.

Council President Menke thought the criteria had been met. Workforce housing was desperately needed. She was not in favor of converting the SFD 32 lots into SFD 40 lots because the SFD 32 lots would be less expensive and increased the chances for some people to buy a home. There was more than adequate parking, and she was not concerned about the wetlands.

City Attorney Koch said the issues of creating a condition that established the sale or rental price of some of the homes as affordable housing and eliminating the SFD 32 lots and putting in SFD 40 lots instead were not raised during the public hearing portion of the process to allow the applicant the opportunity to address them. If the Council wanted to move forward with imposing those conditions, the public hearing should be reopened for the applicant to discuss the impacts.

Councilor Drabkin thought affordable housing had been discussed with the applicant and according to the applicant's proposal, they were already suggesting that a larger percentage would be affordable housing. She was asking for a guarantee of 20% and in the application it stated 26.9% would be affordable housing.

City Attorney Koch said it came down to fairness and allowing the applicant to have input before imposing conditions that limited how they could sell certain lots or the size of the lots.

Councilor Ruden did not want to reopen the hearing for the SFD 32 lot size issue.

Councilor Drabkin said the City had a long history with local builders and she trusted that the applicant would provide affordable housing for the community which was a trade-off for the variances.

Based on the findings of fact, the conclusionary findings for approval, and the materials submitted by the applicant, Council President Menke MOVED to ADOPT Ordinance 5021 with the amendment to Condition 26 regarding the six months following final plat approval rather than preliminary plat approval; the amendment to Condition 4 fixing the typographical error of 111,393 to 11,393 square feet; the amendment to Condition 3 regarding the SFD 60 lots front yard setback as 15 feet rather than 20 feet; and the amendment to Condition 4 to add language at the end of paragraph 1 that stated “Additionally Tract C and Tract D of BCW and Active Space A of BCE shall be landscaped with turf and appropriate benches, trash cans, and picnic tables shall be provided and reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee as part of the landscape plan. All the detention areas and passive open spaces shall be landscaped and reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee as part of the landscape plan.” The motion was seconded by Councilor Ruden.

City Attorney Koch read by title only Ordinance No. 5021 amending the Zoning Map designation from EF- 80 (Exclusive Farm Use – 80-acre minimum) to R-1 PD (Single-Family Residential Planned Development) on approximately 13.6 acres of land, and from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-1 PD (Single-Family Residential Planned Development) on approximately 17.23 acres of land, and amending Planned Development Ordinance No. 4626 to encompass an additional 30.83 acres of land to allow variation in lot sizes and setback requirement to include: a reduction in the front yard setback for certain lots from 20 to 15 feet; a reduction in the side yard setback for certain lots from 10 feet to either 7.5 feet, 5 feet or 3 feet; and a reduction in the exterior side yard setback for certain lots from 20 feet to 15 feet. (No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.) Ordinance No. 5021 PASSED by a unanimous roll-call vote.

City Attorney Koch said this decision could be appealed to LUBA by filing a notice of intent to appeal within 21 days after the Council’s land use decision became final, which was 30 days from today’s date.

8. ORDINANCES

- 8.a. Ordinance No. 5020: An Ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan Map designation from Residential to Commercial, and from Commercial to Residential, on portions of an existing property and lot of record, and

rezoning portions of said property from a combination of EF-40 (Exclusive Farm Use – 40-Acre Minimum), R-1 (Single Family Residential), and C-3 (General Commercial).

Associate Planner Chuck Darnell said this ordinance amended the Comprehensive Plan map for two parcels of property at 2121 NE 27th Street. They wanted to partition the lot into two parcels. Two Comprehensive Plan designations and three zoning districts applied to the property. There were previous land use decisions on the subject site, ANX 5-86, CPA 4-86, ZC 12-86, and MP 8-86. A survey was recorded in 1995 that created the existing lot of record and this was the lot to be partitioned. The request was to remove the County zoning and designate each new property as a single land use designation on the Comprehensive Plan Map and as a single zoning district. He summarized the findings for the review criteria. The original condition of approval stated if building permits were requested for the southern parcel, landscaping would be required along the western and northern portions of the site to provide buffering. Since the Planning Commission meeting, additional testimony had been received from a neighboring property concerned about the level of noise and activity on the site. Staff communicated that concern with the applicant and the applicant was willing to add landscaping at this time to the western property line to provide buffering. Staff suggested amending Condition 4 to the zone change, to require landscaping be provided at the time of rezoning and that it would be tied to the issuance of building permits for the northern parcel. A single family home would be built on this parcel. Staff recommended approval.

City Attorney Koch read by title only Ordinance No. 5020 amending the Comprehensive Plan Map designation from Residential to Commercial, and from Commercial to Residential, on portions of an existing property and lot of record, and rezoning portions of said property from a combination of EF-40 (Exclusive Farm Use – 40-Acre Minimum), R-1 (Single Family Residential), and C-3 (General Commercial). (No Councilor present requested that the Ordinance be read in full.) Ordinance No. 5020 PASSED by a unanimous roll-call vote.

9. ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS

9. a. Reports from Councilors on Committee and Board Assignments

None.

9.b. Department Head Reports

None.

9.c. Building Division Reports

None.

10. ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Hill adjourned the Regular City Council Meeting at 12:50 a.m, April 26, 2017.

s/s Melissa Grace
Melissa Grace, City Recorder