



City of McMinnville  
Community Development Department  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311  
[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

## MEMO

**DATE:** August 17, 2023  
**TO:** Planning Commission Members  
**FROM:** Tom Schauer, Senior Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Written Testimony Submitted for PDA 2-23, TML 1-23, L 25-23

### STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



### GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Guide growth & development strategically, responsibly & responsibly to enhance our unique character.

**OBJECTIVE/S:** Strategically plan for short and long-term growth and development that will create enduring value for the community

---

Attached is public testimony submitted regarding Stratus Village, Dockets PDA 2-23, TML 1-23, L 25-23.

- August 15, 2023 E-Mail from Willard and Jamie Baker
- August 17, 2023 Memo from Tegan Enloe

**From:** [Heather Richards](#)  
**To:** [Tom Schauer](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Stratus Village Project Concerns  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 16, 2023 3:02:40 PM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

*Have a great day!*

*Heather*



**Heather Richards**  
Community Development Director  
503-474-5107 (phone)  
971-287-8322 (cell)  
[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

---

**From:** Heather Richards  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2023 9:57 PM  
**To:** Jamie Baker <jmebak543@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Stratus Village Project Concerns

**Hi Willard and Jamie,**

Thank you for your comments below. I am cc'ing Tom Schauer, the Senior Planner, on this project and he will enter your comments into the record, providing them to the Planning Commission as they consider this land-use application.

*Have a great day!*

*Heather*

---



Heather Richards  
Community Development Director  
503-474-5107 (phone)  
971-287-8322 (cell)  
[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

---

**From:** Jamie Baker <[jmebaker543@gmail.com](mailto:jmebaker543@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2023 8:29 PM  
**To:** Heather Richards <[Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov](mailto:Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Stratus Village Project Concerns

**This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.**

---

We are writing regarding our concerns with the Stratus Village project. AS residents living off Stratus Ave we have serious concerns regarding the infrastructure of the intersection of Stratus Ave and Norton Lane. As it is now, this is a three way stop with only incoming traffic from Hwy 18 not stopping. Understandably it is this way because of the short roadway on Norton Lane coming off of Hwy 18 to prevent a back up. After using this intersection regularly since we moved here eight years ago we frequently see cars coming from Hwy 18 also stopping; causing confusion for all cars at this intersection. With the amount of increased traffic created by the significant increase in population this development will ensue, we are asking that there be consideration for improved markings, signage, or possibly even blinking yellow and red lights to be installed to improve both driver and pedestrian safety, and to decrease driver

confusion. Another area of concern is traffic entering Stratus Ave from a street next to the trailer park. These two streets/exits to Stratus seem to be very close together possibly causing traffic issues.

We also have concerns of existing homeowner security and safety with the increase of population and we would like to know how the city plans to address this possible issue.

Thank you for your consideration,

Willard and Jamie Baker  
1935 SE Noble Ln  
McMinnville, OR 97128

**From:** [Tegan Enloe](#)  
**To:** [Heather Richards](#)  
**Cc:** [John Bridges](#); [Tom Schauer](#); [Frank Roberti](#); [Jerry A Jones](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Continuance Request  
**Date:** Thursday, August 17, 2023 11:06:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[We sent you safe versions of your files.msg](#)  
[Stratus Village Traffic Comments\\_FINAL.pdf](#)

---

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

---

**This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.**

---

Hello Heather,

Thank you so much for your assistance. I will be testifying in opposition. I have attached my memo for distribution to the planning commission. I believe Mr. Roberti is also planning to attend and will have remarks as well. I am not sure if he has requested to be included in the testimony list yet?

Please note that Mr. Roberti does not oppose the eventual approval of the master plan amendment so the development can move forward. His primary concern is that adequate consideration has not yet been given to mitigate impacts to his property. We have specific concerns with the proposed lay out that combines both parking lots and provides shared access to parking spaces, drive aisles, and driveways. We would like to see a physical separation between Mr. Roberti's property, parking spaces, and driveway from those used by the housing development. That way, Mr. Roberti can preserve access to his spaces for his clients/tenants. Ordinance 5095 requires that amendments be compatible, to the extent possible, with existing development and we don't believe compatibility has been given appropriate consideration. We are asking the commission to direct the applicant to work with Mr. Roberti to separate out his parking lot.

We also would like to see additional traffic analysis completed. I was unable to find a standalone traffic analysis report that has a full summary of the proposed changes, considerations for compatibility from a traffic standpoint, safety analysis, trip distribution, etc. And we'd like more work done to develop a local trip generation rate for the affordable housing land use as opposed to using multifamily rates from the ITE Trip Gen Manual.

I think ultimately these concerns can all be addressed with more time and collaboration from the applicant and in the end the development can be updated to better support the existing adjacent uses. We look forward to working with everyone to resolve these issues.

Thanks!

Tegan

On Wed, Aug 16, 2023 at 8:13 PM Heather Richards  
<[Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov](mailto:Heather.Richards@mcminnvilleoregon.gov)> wrote:



CONSULTING, LLC

DATE: August 17, 2023

TO: City of McMinnville Planning Commission; Heather Richards, Community Development Director;  
Tom Schauer, Senior Planner

FROM: Tegan Enloe, PE / Enloe Consulting, LLC

SUBJECT: Stratus Village – Planned Development Amendment

---

Enloe Consulting, LLC, submits the following testimony and request on behalf of our client Frank Roberti who owns the property at 235 SE Norton Ln. In addition, our client would like to ask the Planning Commission to consider the following two requests, which are laid out in more detail below.

**Request 1: Set a condition of approval for the applicant that requires physical separation and removal of shared parking spaces between Mr. Roberti's property and the proposed housing development**

Mr. Roberti's property is a currently leased out medical office complex that he purchased in 2018 from the original developer Burch Feero Property, Inc. When the property was purchased, Mr. Roberti was told that the adjacent property (currently the subject of the proposed Planned Development Amendment) would later be developed as additional medical office buildings, as is included in the Three Mile Lane Master Plan. The proximity of additional medical offices would be desirable because it has the potential to generate more business for tenants and support the success of his investment.

The property Mr. Roberti purchased is also bound by a set of CC&R's that outline a shared parking agreement that makes a large portion of the existing parking spaces available for use by the adjacent property once developed. Mr. Roberti entered into this transaction and agreement with the understanding that a compatible, similar use would be sharing access to these spaces, such as medical office building or hospital use.

Our client is supportive of access to affordable housing and the applicant's desire to create those opportunities in McMinnville. He does not oppose a Planned Development Amendment of the area in question to allow for this. However, he does take issue with the current proposal as the applicant intends to build housing that will have direct access to Mr. Roberti's parking lot and does not clearly separate out Mr. Roberti's existing parking spaces and protect them for his own business use. The shared use of the drive aisles and parking spaces, as currently proposed, creates issues with patients accessing the medical offices and degrades the existing use of his facility.

Mr. Roberti has attempted to address these concerns with the applicant in advance of this meeting. The applicant does not need the "shared parking" spaces to meet City required parking minimums. Those minimums could still be met by either transferring those spaces to Mr. Roberti and creating a physical barrier between his parking lot and theirs or by removing the shared spaces and placing a

barrier in that location instead. If the applicant is open to transferring the “shared parking” spaces exclusively to Mr. Roberti, he is willing to pay fair market value for the acquisition of the property they are on.

Our team requests that the Planning Commission direct the applicant to come to an agreement with Mr. Roberti regarding physical separation of the two parking lots.

**Request 2: A continuance of tonight’s hearing with a request that additional traffic analysis be completed**

Our team requests a continuation of the hearing to allow a more thorough investigation into associated traffic impacts from the proposed Planned Development Amendment. Again, our client does not oppose the eventual change to allow for housing, but instead wants to make sure the necessary care and due diligence has been provided to ensure that impacts to the surrounding roadway network are fully understood and discussed prior to approval. Specific concerns and requests are outlined below.

**Ordinance 5095 – Compatibility Considerations**

Ordinance 5095, which approved the zone change for the subject property allowing multifamily development, requires that any amendment to the master plan must be compatible, to the extent possible, with existing developments. Our team believes that the proposed use can be made to function compatibly with the existing developments, but that adequate consideration has not yet been provided.

Our client has invested significant resources into development, operation, and maintenance of his existing medical office building. These investments were made with the understanding that the adjacent, undeveloped parcel would also eventually build medical offices. This would be a compatible use that would likely generate potential shared clientele, similar hours of operation, and lead to the overall growth and success of our clients' existing development.

The proposed change to housing creates a competing use, specifically with regards to access to parking/demand. Medical office visitors arrive/depart frequently with visits lasting for shorter periods of time, making them high a turnover parking space use. Conversely, residential vehicles tend to remain parked for long periods of time, sometimes days, without moving. If residential vehicles remained parked in the shared spaces for an extended period, it prevents Mr. Roberti’s property visitors from being able to access his building, which can negatively impact his and his tenant’s business operations. As currently proposed, there is no way for Mr. Roberti to enforce exclusive use of his parking spaces by his business patrons, allow for towing, or designation of which spots are provided for which entity.

It is uncommon for medical offices and housing to co-exist in a master planned community, unless the housing is specifically designed for a use that necessitates more frequent access to medical facilities, such as memory care or assisted living housing. The existing application fails to provide consideration

and adequately address how this use change will impact adjacent existing buildings, specifically related to site circulation and parking.

**Request:** Our team requests the applicant prepare an updated traffic analysis that looks at site circulation, parking demands, impacts from their proposed use of shared parking operations, and how medical office and housing can be made to successfully coexist.

### **Trip Generation Assumptions for Affordable Housing**

Transportation engineers are asked to estimate the number of trips a proposed development will generate and add to the surrounding roadway. There are two primary methods to do this. The first and most common is to use the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. This is a national compilation of data used to estimate trips based on proposed SQFT, dwelling units, etc. The other is to record actual trips going to/from a similar local use and then use that information to scale to match the size of the proposed one.

In lieu of performing a traffic analysis for this Planned Development Amendment, the City used the ITE Trip Generation Manual to estimate trips and show that the new use would have less trips than the existing adopted medical office use. This could be true, or it could be inaccurate. The City incorrectly estimated trips assuming the new development would be multifamily apartments. The ITE Trip Generation Manual has a separate trip generation category for affordable housing, recognizing that it has different demands on trips than a traditional multifamily apartment development. However, the data available for affordable housing trip generation is still very limited and even the national data collection efforts do not include many sources.

The applicant owns and operates several existing affordable housing developments in the area. Our team thinks it would be more accurate to request that those locations be counted to see how many vehicles and pedestrians go in and out of those sites and use that to estimate what would be expected demand of this proposed location.

The risk of underestimating the trips is not providing the necessary resources needed on the roadways to accommodate the number of cars and pedestrians going to/from the new site, which can cause congestion and unsafe driving and walking environments. In addition, the current analysis has not provided any consideration for how trips from the housing development would be distributed through the master planned area driveways, including through Mr. Roberti's property, to access the roadway network. Trips going through Mr. Roberti's drive aisles and driveway could have a detrimental impact to his existing business operations.

**Request:** Our team requests an updated analysis using affordable housing trip generation rates derived from actual data collected in Oregon at nearby, built and occupied affordable housing developments. Locations used for data collection and rate development must be mutually agreed upon by our team, the applicant, and the City with special consideration given to location, proximity to public transit, and development size. Data should be collected by a third party, independent count vendor in Oregon with a history of performing these studies.



### **Traffic Analysis Technical Report**

The current application provides one table of traffic analysis that looks at estimated trips for the currently adopted Planned Development and compares them to the proposed change. This is not sufficient consideration.

A more acceptable consideration of impacts would be a report that includes the following:

- Discussion of compatibility with existing developments
- Review of traffic operations at driveways (existing and proposed) that the development trips would access
- Consideration of pedestrian connections to transit in the area
- Review of safety/crash data at the existing and proposed driveways and surrounding study area
- Summary of characteristics of the site, including a map that shows this areas orientation in the overall masted planned area
- Discussion of other in-process applications (such as the parcel to the south)
- Review of trip generation assumptions and manner used for calculating trips
- Prepared by a licensed transportation engineer in the state of Oregon

Our team believes the applicant has failed to provide the necessary documentation and analysis to support their requested Planned Development Amendment, and that a continuation of the hearing is necessary so these questions can be answered.