



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

October 21, 2020
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

12:00 pm
ZOOM Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Sharon Gunter, John Hall, Tim McDaniel, and Rob Stephenson
Members Absent: Josh Kearns
Staff Present: Jamie Fleckenstein - Associate Planner
Guests Present: Zach Geary – City Councilor, Kellie Menke - City Councilor, Howard Aster, Aaron Baker, and Brian Wicks

1. Call to Order

Chair Stephenson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

- May 12, 2020
- May 20, 2020

Committee Member McDaniel moved to approve the May 12 and 20, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Hall and passed unanimously.

4. Action/Docket Item (repeat if necessary)

A. L 31-20 – Landscape Plan Review - Valley's Edge Phase V Subdivision – Street Tree Plan

Associate Planner Fleckenstein discussed the Street Tree Plan for Valley's Edge Phase V subdivision. He explained the location and site plan. It was a single street with houses on both sides. The proposed street tree was the Red Sunset Maple. This was the same street tree approved for the adjacent subdivision. There was one street tree for every lot except for Lot 114 due to the narrow frontage combined with the utilities and driveway. Some of the lots had two street trees. He reviewed the conditions of approval.

Committee Member Gunter asked who was responsible for watering the trees.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said it would be the developer or property owner who was responsible for the first year at minimum. This plan said individual property owners could choose to extend irrigation from the lot to the planter strip to provide watering. That was the responsibility of the property owner. Maintenance including watering, pruning, and replacement would be the responsibility of the developer for the first year.

Committee Member Hall asked who maintained the trees if there was no property owner.

Chair Stephenson asked when the trees would be planted, all at one time when the lots were empty or when the lot had been sold.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said the trees were generally planted in the planting season following the construction of the home.

Howard Aster, applicant, clarified they waited until a home was built so they would know where the driveway and utilities were located. They typically planted the trees in winter which was the best time for the trees to get water. The home owners would take over the responsibility of the street trees. If the home was not sold, they would have the responsibility until it was sold.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said the developer would provide a security to the City for the street trees and in order to get the security returned, the developer had to show that the trees were thriving and successful.

Committee Member Gunter moved to approve L 31-20 with conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member McDaniel and passed unanimously.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said the Committee might want to keep street tree diversity in mind for future street tree plans. Staff thought the red maple was warranted in this area because it was a continuation of street trees that had been approved for the adjacent subdivision and the consistency was appropriate.

Chair Stephenson said the problem was certain varieties of trees were not currently available.

B. L 34-20 – Landscape Plan Review - 1500 SW Baker Street – Aunty Linda's Car Sales

Associate Planner Fleckenstein presented the landscape plan review for Aunty Linda's Car Sales on SW Baker Street. He described the subject site that included a marijuana dispensary with container landscaping in the front of the structure. The lot was entirely paved and had a variety of past uses. The current proposed use was a car sales lot and they would be adding a small modular sales office. There would also be parking spaces to accommodate the commercial use. The applicant proposed providing planters around an accessibility ramp that led from the parking to the sales office. The planters would be made out of cedar plank, however he spoke with the applicant recently and that had changed to a galvanized planter that had a cedar skeleton.

Aaron Baker, representing the applicant, said the owner thought the cedar boxes would impact his budget dramatically and wanted to find an alternative that would still look pleasing and had character and design to it. They were proposing to use a 2 foot by 60 inch by 2 foot galvanized trough that had a drain on the side. They would be picture framed in a 2 x 4 cedar box, a skeletal frame, and that would give them a nice blend of polished galvanized and natural stained cedar and plants above that.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said the plants that were proposed were a combination of lower growing evergreen and deciduous shrubs and a number of small flower herbaceous perennials and annuals. Irrigation would be provided to each of the planters in a drip system.

Chair Stephenson asked if there was a water source on site.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said there was a water source available on the adjacent property that the applicant made an arrangement to use.

Mr. Baker confirmed they had an agreement to share the bathroom facility and water supply on the adjacent lot.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein discussed the review criteria. The applicant was providing more landscaping than was required for commercial development. There was an existing fence separating this lot from the adjacent residential lot which was chain link with privacy slats. The orientation of the sales office and landscaping would be to the west which would provide additional screening. Staff thought the landscaping was compatible with the proposed use and surrounding properties. Because the parking lot was not being improved beyond restriping for the parking spaces, staff found that the use of parking lot islands and landscaping was not required at this time. There was not a dedicated planter strip along Highway 99W and street trees were not required. Irrigation would be provided to the individual planters. He then reviewed the conditions of approval.

Committee Member Hall would like a sketch of what the planter boxes would look like, especially since this would be on a busy street.

There was discussion regarding the proposed design of the boxes.

Mr. Baker suggested if it was a matter of street view, that the front of the boxes that would be seen from the right-of-way would be cedar and the back of the planters just a frame.

Associate Planner Fleckenstein suggested administrative review and approval of the boxes so the project would not be delayed. They could add a condition that the street view side of the boxes would be framed in cedar to hide the galvanized planter and the sides that would not be seen from the right-of-way could be the framed galvanized planter.

Chair Stephenson suggested putting in trailing plant material on the back side that would disguise it.

Committee Member Gunter moved to approve L 34-20 with conditions proposed by staff and the added condition regarding the planter boxes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member McDaniel and passed unanimously.

C. L 33-20 – Street Tree Removal - 210 SE Davis Street

Associate Planner Fleckenstein discussed the street tree removal application to remove two Birch trees that had died on SE Davis Street. Staff concurred that the trees were dead and removal and replacement was warranted. Both trees would be replaced with small species from the street tree list that were appropriate under power lines.

Committee Member Hall moved to approve L 33-20 with conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Gunter and passed unanimously.

D. L 21-18 – Landscape Plan Review - 1819 NE Baker Street

Associate Planner Fleckenstein described the landscape plan for 1819 NE Baker Street for an addition to the commercial building. In 2018 a landscape plan was submitted suggesting that the existing landscaping around the property was sufficient to meet the requirements. There was a section of the landscaping chapter that specifically pointed out a formula for calculating the required landscaping for additions that increased lot coverage. After applying the formula, 335 square feet of additional landscaping was required. He explained the existing landscaping on the lot. There were additional paved parking stalls adjacent to the new addition and a 460 square foot area for new landscaping that was proposed to be lawn.

Chair Stephenson thought a few trees should be planted as well to match the trees on the other side of the lot.

Brian Wicks, representing the applicant, said the applicant planned to put in some boulders there. He could suggest adding trees.

There was consensus to add a condition for two trees to match the other side of the lot.

Committee Member Gunter moved to approve L 21-18 with conditions proposed by staff and the added condition regarding the trees. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Hall and passed unanimously.

E. L 30-20 – Landscape Plan Review - 225 NE Norton Lane – McDonald’s

Associate Planner Fleckenstein explained the landscape plan for McDonald’s on NE Norton Lane. He discussed the existing conditions of the site with the restaurant in the middle of the lot and parking and drive aisles surrounding it. They were proposing to add a second drive-thru service lane. In order to do so, they had to remove the parking from the northwest portion of the property. Landscape islands would be added to help define the new circulation pattern. The trash enclosure would be relocated to the southwest corner of the property. Landscaping was proposed around the new drive-thru service lanes and around the new trash enclosure. All of the existing landscaping elsewhere around the site would remain the same. Around the trash enclosure the applicant proposed Wax-leaf Privet Ligustrum as a hedge which satisfied the requirement. A variety of deciduous and evergreen flowering shrubs as well as ornamental grasses and evergreen groundcover would be planted in the other landscape areas. By the main entrance to the restaurant, there would be an open lawn area with a Dogwood tree. There would be Capital Flowering Pear trees in the landscape islands. He discussed the conditions of approval.

Committee Member Gunter moved to approve L 30-20 with conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Hall and passed unanimously.

5. Discussion Items

None

6. Old/New Business

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said Committee Member Gunter and McDaniel’s positions were expiring and if they wanted to return, they would have to fill out an application.

7. Committee/Commissioner Comments

Committee Member Hall reminded the Committee about irrigation best practices he had forwarded to staff.

8. Staff Comments

Associate Planner Fleckenstein said at the next meeting they would be looking at the tree code to identify areas that needed to be amended.

9. Adjournment

Chair Stephenson adjourned the meeting at 1:08 p.m.