



City of McMinnville  
Planning Department  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

September 7, 2023  
Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm  
Hybrid Meeting  
McMinnville, Oregon

**Members Present:** Sidonie Winfield, Dan Tucholsky, Beth Rankin, Rachel Flores, Megan Murray, Brian Randall, Gary Langenwaller, and Matt Deppe

**Members Absent:** Sylla McClellan

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Community Development Director, Tom Schauer – Senior Planner, Bill Kabeiseman – Bateman Seidel, Contracted Legal Counsel, and Beth Goodman – ECONorthwest, Consultant

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Winfield called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## 2. Swear In New Commissioner – Rachel Flores

Chair Winfield administered the oath of office to new Commissioner Rachel Flores.

## 3. Citizen Comments

None

## 4. Minutes

- May 4, 2023

Commissioner Tucholsky MOVED to APPROVE the May 4, 2023 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Murray and passed 8-0.

## 5. Public Hearings

- A. Legislative Hearing: Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt: A New Housing Needs Analysis (G 1-20) and A New Economic Opportunities Analysis (G 3-20)

*(Continued from May 18, 2023)*

Requests: G 1-20 - This is a legislative amendment, initiated by the City of McMinnville, to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt a new Housing Needs Analysis, including a residential buildable land inventory.  
G 3-20 - This is a legislative amendment, initiated by the City of McMinnville, to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt a new Economic Opportunities Analysis, including a buildable land inventory for employment and other non-residential land use.

Applicant: City of McMinnville

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none.

Staff Report: Community Development Director Richards gave a background on the work that had been done for growth planning in the City. Tonight's public hearing would review draft results of the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis, and Public Land Need Analysis. She explained the value of planning for growth. Affordability was critical and an increasing problem in McMinnville. Housing supply contributed to affordability, and supply was an increasing problem. The City was considered severely rent burdened. She discussed the population forecast for the City. They should not assume all multi-family housing was low income. As lots got smaller, access to open space was more important. She then reviewed the documents, which had recently been updated. This included the process to develop them, Buildable Lands Inventory, mix of housing types, deficit of land for new housing, Mac Town 2032 Economic Development Strategic Plan, land need for housing and employment, land added to the UGB in 2020 for public uses compared with estimated public land needs through 2041, how they were going to meet the need, public testimony received, assertions and conclusions made by 1,000 Friends of Oregon and Friends of Yamhill County, park land need, how the Project Advisory Committee and Public Lands Work Group elected to move forward with the existing levels of service in the adopted Parks Master Plan of six acres per 1,000 capita, and where parks should be located. She recommended the Parks Department update the Parks System Table to reflect the classifications in the Master Plan. The 6-acre LOS for greenspaces, greenways, and natural areas could be located on either buildable land or unbuildable land and should reflect the values and objectives of the Master Plan and could be a land use efficiency that was evaluated in 2024. She also recommended inviting Parks and Recreation Director Muir to the next Commission meeting to address these issues and give an update on the Master Plan process. She gave perspective for discussion on expansion to meet the land deficiency that had been identified. They needed 484 acres, which was one-tenth of one percent of the total acreage in Yamhill County. That was smaller than many of the farm tracts in the County. She recommended continuing the public hearing.

There was discussion regarding the need to update the data, questioning the assumptions and not think the past was a good predictor of the future, trend of home based offices and not as much need for office space, being more proactive, how if the forecasts were wrong and they brought in too much land there would be less land to bring in the next time, parkland need and levels of service, definition of park, how the additional acres of Joe Dancer Park that came into the UGB with the last effort was classified, how they could not rely on using school property in the calculations for parks as there was no agreement, talking to vacant property owners about developing, incentives for workforce housing, and how smaller lots were not less expensive due to the supply issue.

Proponents: None

Opponents: Mark Davis, McMinnville resident, did not think they needed to add more land to the UGB in the next 20 years, especially after the recent UGB approval. They were being asked to approve another EOA even though the last one was only ten years old and additional parkland when the parkland just added exceeded the acreage of all the parks that had been developed in the history of the City. The urban reserve process would sequester even more land ending in 2067, all the while the need for affordable housing continued. He thought the priorities were misplaced and there was no justification for the acreage requested, especially the land for parks. The 1999 Parks Master Plan had expired without reaching the goal of 14 acres of parks per 1,000 population. They had less park acreage per 1,000 residents than they did in 1999. He thought the City had all the land it needed for park development for the next 50 years.

There was discussion regarding how much land to set aside in developments for parks and lack of funding for parks.

Rob Hallyburton, Friends of Yamhill County, said they were in favor of the City adopting the documents, however they were in opposition to some of the elements of the plan. They had submitted a letter with suggestions to make sure the HNA contributed positively. The HNA did not account for the existing deficiencies in the housing options today. They needed to avoid over-estimation of land, especially to reduce the potential conversion of excellent farmland to urban uses before it was truly needed. Compact development was better for the City as it made more efficient use of public infrastructure and helped with housing affordability. They recommended the City take a more aggressive approach to planning for higher density development. Regarding economic development, the EOA, like the HNA, assumed less efficient use of land than the existing plan. This created an inflated forecast for both residential and employment lands. He thought changes could be implemented quickly and cheaply through the use of allowed safe harbors.

Sid Friedman, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, thought the changes they suggested would better serve the needs of those who lived and worked in the City, both now and in the future. McMinnville had larger minimum lot sizes than other cities, which affected their ability to provide housing at different price points. Another land capacity issue was the parkland projections. The UGB analysis assumed that half of the residential land added in 2020 would be used for parkland and churches. The City could use the safe harbor rule that 25% of additional residential land would account for streets, parks, and schools. There was a reduction in density from 5.7 units per acre to 5.46, which did not meet the City's needs. They suggested instead to use the safe harbor of 8 units per acre. The HNA assumed no new housing on C-3 land after the year 2021, which was incorrect. Regarding the EOA, there were too many jobs that needed new vacant employment land. The EOA assumed that only 5% of new jobs would occur on residential land around existing employment sites, but the census data said people working from home far surpassed the 5% and home occupations didn't begin to count all the people working in residential zones. Regarding the large Linfield site, if the land wasn't sold it would either be student housing or new employment.

There was discussion regarding how changing lot minimums would affect housing density and prices, farmland preservation, and parkland.

Rebuttal: Community Development Director Richards clarified the impact of 484 acres of EFU land in the County for an UGB expansion was about two-tenths of one percent. About half the

County land was EFU. In the last UGB amendment, 56% of the acreage was EFU land and 44% was not. There were two phases of the last UGB amendment, and phase 1 did not have any parkland assigned to it. Phase 2 was making up for that deficit, but it was meant to be distributed across all the acreage. Median home prices in Newberg were \$575,000. Their market rate housing was still at a higher level than McMinnville.

Commissioner Flores MOVED to CONTINUE the hearing for Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt: A New Housing Needs Analysis (G 1-20) and A New Economic Opportunities Analysis (G 3-20) to September 21, 2023, with the record open. SECONDED by Commissioner Langenwalter. The motion PASSED 8-0.

### **B. Quasi - Judicial Hearing: Planned Development Amendment (Docket G 3-23)**

Requests: Review and approval of a Planned Development Amendment (PDA 3-23) for a mixed-use development on a 6.63-acre property located at the NE corner of Baker Creek Road and Hill Road. The application includes a request to amend provisions of Planned Development Ordinance #5086 and to approve the proposed master plan for the property.

The proposed master plan includes: four mixed use buildings with two stories of residential use above ground floor commercial use, three 3-story buildings with multi-dwelling residential use, and on-site green space, plaza, and bicycle and pedestrian amenities. This includes 30,000 total square feet of commercial space and 144 total residences (72 above the ground-floor commercial in the four mixed-use buildings and 24 in each of the three-story residential buildings).

Applicant: Baker Creek 2, LLC, c/o Mark DeLapp

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner had visited the site. All commissioners present raised their hands. Chair Winfield asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Staff Report: Senior Planner Schauer said this was a request for amendments to the Planned Development conditions of approval and request for approval of the Planned Development Master Plan. He discussed the 6.63 acre subject site at the NE corner of Baker Creek Road and Hill Road, zoning map, proposed mixed use development, site plan, applicable criteria, additional information entered into the record, summary of the requested changes to the conditions which were more restrictive than C-3 standards, alternative design components with submittal of development plans, proposed master plan cross section, proposed master plan site plan, trail and greenspace, renderings and elevations of the proposed development, adjacent hazelnut orchard, and landscape plan. Staff found the criteria were satisfied with conditions and recommended approval with conditions.

There was discussion regarding bike storage, hours of operation for the commercial activity, configuration of the site, and adequate parking.

Applicant's Testimony:

Kevin Grant and John Wright, C2K Architecture, discussed how they came up with the design for the Baker Creek North project and creating a neighborhood activity center with gathering spaces and main street concept. They thought it was an efficient parking plan with adequate parking for the units. They did not have bike storage planned. There would be a cover over the bike corral on the plaza.

Mark DeLapp, applicant, said in order to get the commercial space with this kind of look and feel, they had to have enough residential income to support the construction budget, which was why there was three story residential buildings.

Mr. Grant thought it was important architecturally to have the three stories to replicate a main street look.

There was discussion regarding shared parking with the residential and commercial uses, how they were using the data and requirements for the number of parking spots, encouraging bicycle and pedestrian activity, parking for second and third vehicles assigned further away, use of permeable pavement, stormwater retention, how the commercial uses would be businesses that could provide services to the neighborhood, the work/live units would be residential until there was demand for retail and then they would be used for retail, making it fit with the look of McMinnville, special events that might close the street, marketing to businesses, how the project could pencil with the number of residential units without the commercial, all the residential would be market rate housing, mitigation for the hazelnut orchard, approval criteria, laundry facilities, and garbage units.

The Commission had no issues with the proposed setbacks, three story buildings, and live/work spaces.

{The recording of the meeting ended at this point}

Commissioner Deppe MOVED to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of PDA 3-23 to the McMinnville City Council. SECONDED by Commissioner Murray. The motion PASSED 7-1.

## **6. Commissioner Comments**

## **7. Staff Comments**

## **8. Adjournment**

# MINUTES

**September 21, 2023  
Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting**

**6:30 pm  
Hybrid Meeting  
McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Sidonie Winfield, Dan Tucholsky, Beth Rankin, Rachel Flores, Megan Murray, Brian Randall, Sylla McClellan, and Matt Deppe

**Members Absent:** Gary Langenwalter

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Community Development Director, Tom Schauer – Senior Planner, Bill Kabeiseman – Bateman Seidel, Contracted Legal Counsel, and Beth Goodman – ECONorthwest, Consultant

---

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Winfield called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Public Hearings

### **A. Quasi-Judicial Hearing: Stratus Village: Planned Development Amendment (PDA 2-23), Three Mile Lane Design Review (TML 1-23), and Landscape Plan Review (L 25-23)**

*(Continued from August 17, 2023)*

**Request:** The applicant, Structure Development Advisors LLC c/o Mike Andrews, on behalf of property owner Housing Authority of Yamhill County (HAYC), is requesting concurrent review and approval of three applications for the Stratus Village 175-unit multi-dwelling development on a property of approximately 6.5 acres: a Planned Development Amendment (PDA 2-23), a Three Mile Lane Review (TML 1-23), and a Landscape Plan Review (L 25-23).

**PDA 2-23.** The property is subject to an existing Planned Development Overlay Ordinance which includes the subject properties and adjacent properties. The proposal includes revisions to the original Planned Development master plan for the subject properties, which requires approval of a Planned Development Amendment. The master plan for the subject properties will replace the existing plan for medical offices with the proposed plan for apartments. The new Master Plan is also subject to the provisions of Ordinance 5095, which amended the terms of the previous Planned Development Overlay Ordinance.

**TML 1-23.** The subject property is within the Three Mile Lane Planned Development Overlay, established by Ordinance 4131 and subsequently revised by Ordinances 4572, 4666, 4988, and 5101. The proposed development is subject to policies and standards of the Three Mile Lane Planned Development Overlay Ordinance.

**L 25-23.** The proposal includes a landscape plan review, which is required for multi-dwelling development, subject to the provisions of Chapter 17.57 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Location: 235 SE Norton Lane, Tax Lots R4427 400, 404, and 405

Applicant: Structure Development Advisors LLC c/o Mike Andrews, on behalf of property owner Housing Authority of Yamhill County (HAYC)

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner had visited the site. Commissioners Winfield, Tucholsky, Rankin, Deppe, Flores, and McClellan had visited the site. Chair Winfield asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

Staff Report: Senior Planner Schauer said the application had been continued from August 17. This was a concurrent review of three applications for Stratus Village, a 175 unit multi-dwelling development. He discussed the additional public testimony that had been received since the August 17 hearing, criteria and standards, proposed development, summary of issues discussed at the last meeting and staff's analysis, parking, and private open space. Staff recommended approval with conditions. The decision document had been updated with the date and procedural findings, incorporated public testimony, revised Condition #16b of the Planned Development regarding stormwater drainage plan to reflect the language in the staff report, and change to the proposed landscape plan regarding the fence.

There was discussion regarding the shared parking agreement.

Applicant's Testimony: Vickie Ybarguen, Housing Authority, said the Housing Authority owned their properties long term and took great pride in their properties. They offered important affordable housing assistance to members of the community.

Mike Andrews, Project Manager, discussed the work they had done to address the concerns from the last hearing. He gave a project overview including the project partners, description, unit mix and affordability, timeline, and housing affordability. He gave a recap of the August 17 hearing feedback and response to feedback including bike parking, trash enclosure, fence, patio privacy, north elevation design, open space, number of parking spaces, and location of the parking.

There was discussion regarding constraints that led to sharing patios rather than individual patios, maintenance of the shared balconies, how there would be no covered sport court, planned play structures, changing the arborvitae to be six feet apart, resident application process, a/c units would not block windows, no current grants to get the sport court covered, additional details on the windows on the north elevation carried over to other buildings, bike

lockers and shelters, and what was submitted for approval and what was their aspiration that they were trying to do to respond to the comments.

Proponents: Cozette Tran-Caffee was in support of the project.

Opponents: None.

Commissioner Deppe MOVED to CLOSE the public hearing. SECONDED by Commissioner McClellan. The motion PASSED 8-0.

Chair Winfield closed the public hearing.

The applicant waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Commissioner Randall MOVED to APPROVE Stratus Village: Planned Development Amendment (PDA 2-23), Three Mile Lane Design Review (TML 1-23), and Landscape Plan Review (L 25-23) with the proposed conditions and added conditions that the arborvitae along the perimeter be planted 6 feet apart and the bike lockers and storage units be deleted from the landscape plan. SECONDED by Commissioner Tucholsky. The motion PASSED 8-0.

**B. Legislative Hearing: Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt: A New Housing Needs Analysis (G 1-20) and A New Economic Opportunities Analysis (G 3-20)**

*(Continued from September 7, 2023)*

Requests: G 1-20 - This is a legislative amendment, initiated by the City of McMinnville, to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt a new Housing Needs Analysis, including a residential buildable land inventory.

G 3-20 - This is a legislative amendment, initiated by the City of McMinnville, to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt a new Economic Opportunities Analysis, including a buildable land inventory for employment and other non-residential land use.

Applicant: City of McMinnville

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. Commissioner McClellan was absent at the last hearing, but had watched the meeting on Zoom.

Staff Report: Community Development Director Richards said the request was to recommend to City Council the adoption of the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis, and Public Lands Need Analysis as amendments to the McMinnville Comprehensive Plan. She discussed the population forecast used, planning for growth which was required by state law and was about balance, three steps to growth planning: identification of need, land use efficiencies, and UGB alternative analysis, document review and why they needed to be updated, process to develop them, public engagement, buildable lands inventory update, and land need for housing, employment, and public/institutional uses. The total land need had changed from 484 acres to



422 acres for the planning horizon of 2021-2041 UGB and 1,638 acres for the planning horizon of 2041-2067 urban reserve area. She pointed out corrections to the record and reviewed staff's response to public testimony. She then discussed parkland need in the Comprehensive Plan policies and Parks Master Plan and the error in the parkland calculations for the 2021 MGMUP UGB expansion. Due to this error, the public land need had been reduced to 32 acres. The findings from the MGMUP indicated that the reduction of the land for greenways and open spaces was calculated and accounted for as part of the park land need for the MGMUP. The location of parks was defined by many attributes and not just whether or not it was part of a floodplain. The Parks Master Plan update was currently underway and there would be discussion regarding how much greenspace and open space should be in unbuildable lands.

She discussed the Friends testimony, and how staff had synthesized the comments and provided options for the Planning Commission to consider, the costs associated with any new directions to pursue, and the staff recommendation. Staff did not think there was anything non-compliant legally. However, two items did not have precedent and case law for interpretation—site specific needs that respond to an Economic Development Plan Strategy that was not captured in the forecast methodology and retail leakage identifying a service deficit. This was a risk for the Commission to consider. Staff also thought they should keep the PAC recommendations when it was based on local data, which was most representative of McMinnville. From staff's perspective, a forecast was not an exact science, regular updates would be required, and moving the goal posts was costly in terms of money and time. They were responsible for making decisions that impacted the lives of both current and future residents who needed to live in the neighborhoods and community that these decisions were forming, 34,500 people today and 47,500 people in the future.

There was discussion regarding the two items that did not have case law.

Bill Kabeiseman, City Attorney, said he did not know other cities that had specifically called out unusual land needs and they increased their land needs analysis by that amount or any that had relied on the concept of retail leakage. He could not tell them that LUBA would find it appropriate. They could just go with the safe harbor, but it could mean they would not have sufficient land.

Beth Goodman, EcoNW consultant, explained the assumption was employment would grow at the same rate as population. Employment growth sometimes happened outside of what was expected. They had looked at how much employment would be on the different needs and backed out that amount of land so they weren't double counting. Including these other needed employment sites was a risk and they did not know how LUBA would rule on it. The retail leakage analysis was about where residents were shopping and for what and if they had that in the City, what could they capture back in McMinnville.

Community Development Director Richards discussed the process for the Economic Development Strategic Plan and how they calculated the land needed to implement the plan. There was a safe harbor where employment grew at the same rate as population and looked at past employment growth and forecasted the future growth from there. The retail leakage was an additional process and came up with a land need to meet the deficit of services in the City.

There was discussion regarding the annexation process for land in the UGB to become part of the City limits and classification of parks and the amount of land assigned to them.

Parks and Recreation Director Muir said the numbers and information in the HNA were correct. The other more detailed categories would be streamlined for the master plan update.

Ms. Goodman said it was 12 acres for retail leakage and it was 49 acres for the other site needs, totaling 61 acres they were talking about as a risk.

Proponents: None.

Opponents: Mark Davis, McMinnville resident, discussed the buildable land added to the UGB from 2003 to 2023, total land added to the UGB from 2003 to 2023, parks that included unbuildable land, current park acreage, and population comparison. He did not think there was a need to expand the UGB. They already had over 200 acres for parks in the City, which was buildable land. They needed to build these parks before more land was added.

Rob Hallyburton, Friends of Yamhill County, discussed what they were trying to accomplish, to improve the quality of life in the County for both urban and rural residents as well as protect natural resources such as farmland. They wanted the City to be able to accommodate growth in compliance with the statewide planning goals and regulations. Agriculture was the most important industry in Yamhill County. There was a state agricultural policy that stated the preservation of a maximum amount of a limited supply of agricultural land was necessary to the conservation of the state's economic resources. This did not mean that UGBs could not expand on farmland; it only meant that farmland should be lowest priority and that farmland loss should be minimized. UGBs promoted compact urban development which could enhance livability and sustainability inside the boundary.

There was discussion regarding the contention that the land owned by Linfield should be counted as available land.

Sid Friedman, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, said their contention was that Linfield planned to develop the land to support its programs.

Commissioner Deppe asked what was the number of acres they were arguing about. What would it take to get to a yes? Mr. Friedman said it was more important for the City to meet its housing needs and provide housing at price points that met the needs of the population.

Mr. Hallyburton said the argument was about how many acres it took to accommodate the needed housing units. He suggested using the safe harbor density number, 8 units per acre. They were advocating for a more incremental growth.

Community Development Director Richards said the 8 units per acre was a 46% increase over the current 5.46 units per acre. There had to be a basis for the number used to meet the need.

Mr. Hallyburton thought the analysis needed to include historic data and trends in housing, and he did not think the second was done.

Ms. Goodman said for the trends, they had adjusted the housing mix and planning for new types of housing. They were planning for a larger share of housing to be either townhomes or multi-family housing.

Commissioner Randall pointed out that they were not removing farmland tonight, they were planning for the future. They would have to do all of this process again in six years.

Chair Winfield thought it was a balance of doing the best they could for citizens and what they were required to do by law. They had to plan for the future of the community as a whole and not just a land use group.

Commissioner Flores said the 20-year delay to expand the UGB had a human cost that was severe and generational. It was a failure to plan and to consider what the population needed. This was an important plan for the future and 61 acres was not worth the human impact.

Mr. Hallyburton said there was already vacant land in the UGB waiting to be developed. This was a longer term decision they were considering and would take ten years before development could occur. He was in no way advocating the City not provide for the needs of its population. The disagreement was on how much land it took to provide for that.

Mr. Friedman spoke about the HNA and how it reduced planned density. He did not think it would meet the City's needs. He compared the minimum density standards of other cities. He then discussed the EOA and how 8.2% of McMinnville workers worked from home which far surpassed the 5% EOA rate. He discussed jobs on residential land or existing employment sites. The EOA had no deadline for completion, and they could take the time to get it right.

Commissioner Randall said they were building smaller than the minimum densities due to planned developments which had smaller lot sizes.

Commissioner Deppe said they needed 202 more acres of residential land. Mr. Friedman was saying that number was too high. He wanted to know how much too high it was.

Mr. Friedman thought the City should reduce the minimum lot sizes.

Community Development Director Richards said the discussion about minimum lot sizes was a land use efficiency discussion, not a land needs discussion. The way the Friends group was bringing it to the table was for the persuasive argument of the existing 5.46 that came from the calculations of the local data vs. the safe harbor of 8.0.

Mr. Friedman said taking the historic density and adjusting it without considering other factors did not give them the needed density to meet the housing needs going forward. He was on the project advisory committee and staff and the consultant presented options, and this was the one they moved forward with. He had brought forward his concerns then and was continuing to advocate for these changes.

Chair Winfield said the City had been working to increase density and they had to work in the best interest of the citizens of McMinnville. The project advisory committee did not move forward with the safe harbor numbers, and focused on the data points that were in front of the Commission. She thought the safe harbor number went against the best interest of the City based on what other citizens said and based on their historic use. She would like the Friends group to work with them, especially when these choices impacted the housing availability of the community.

Rebuttal: Community Development Director Richards said the assumption that higher density created affordability was inherently flawed. Housing supply helped with affordability. If there was no development occurring, the parks did not get built. The City had operated in the red for the past 12 years and did not have the financial means to meet those amenity needs because of the compressed low growth state. Linfield had not master planned their property and had not indicated they planned to build dorms for new students or new classrooms employing more professors. Those lands were set aside as committed lands and not assigned in the population or employment forecast. Regarding the parkland, the over 200 acres reflected the need for the overall population and that they were deficient. It would not be specific to the new UGB land, it was the overall deficiency of parkland for the community. If they changed the level of service, they would need to change the Comprehensive Plan policy. She questioned whether now was the time to do that, or in six years when they had to do this process again. Regarding residential density, they needed

to ask themselves what was the best minimum lot size for McMinnville. They were trying to build great neighborhoods for people to live in that represented the community. It needed to be a community dialogue. They were moving forward with middle housing, however the market dictated the housing products and this community liked certain housing products and did not like others. Regarding the EOA, the 2013 EOA talked about how it was aspirational in terms of what it was trying to achieve for density for jobs. The recent analysis showed they were decreasing jobs per acre and they wanted to build the need on reality.

Ms. Goodman noted that the next step would be developing the Housing Production Strategy. Affordability was beyond land use and zoning, and the strategy was an equity centered product and touched on potential financial incentives and ways they could support development of affordable housing.

Community Development Director Richards said the data they had today was pandemic data and things were starting to change in terms of people working from home. She thought they should revisit it during the update in six years.

Chair Winfield closed the public hearing.

There was discussion regarding risk perspective.

City Attorney Kabeiseman said there was no way to get an advance read on what LCDC would do. It was a quick turnaround of about six months for the LUBA process. He thought the retail leakage and need for employment sites was defensible.

There was discussion regarding removing those two calculations from the EOA.

Commissioner McClellan MOVED to RECOMMEND to City Council the adoption of the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis, and Public Lands Need Analysis with the options to remove the calculations for employment sites, retail leakage, and reduction in parkland. SECONDED by Commissioner Flores. The motion PASSED 8-0.

**C. Legislative Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment (Docket G 3-22)**

*(Continued from August 17, 2023)*

Proposal: **THE CITY OF MCMINNVILLE IS PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE MCMINNVILLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE FOR A NATURAL HAZARDS INVENTORY AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM, AS FOLLOWS:** Amendment to the McMinnville Comprehensive Plan, Volume I - Background Element, adopting the Natural Hazards Inventory and Management Program Options and Recommendations; amendment to the McMinnville Comprehensive Plan, Volume II – Goals and Policies, adding a new Chapter XI, entitled Natural Features; amendments to the McMinnville Municipal Code, Chapters 17.48, Flood Area Zone, and Chapter 17.49, Natural Hazard Overlay Subdistricts; and the adoption of the Natural Hazard Mitigation Zone (NH-M) and Natural Hazard Protection Zone (NH-P)

Applicant: City of McMinnville

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She

asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none.

Staff Report: Community Development Director Richards explained staff was asking for a continuance.

Commissioner Tucholsky MOVED to CONTINUE the hearing for Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Ordinance Amendment (Docket G 3-22) to the October 19, 2023 meeting with the record open. SECONDED by Commissioner McClellan. The motion PASSED 8-0.

#### **4. Commissioner Comments**

Commissioner Flores invited everyone to the candlelight vigil on October 5.

#### **5. Staff Comments**

None

#### **6. Adjournment**

Chair Winfield adjourned the meeting 11:03 p.m.