

MINUTES

March 6, 2024
Landscape Review Committee
Special Meeting

12:00 pm
ZOOM Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Brain Wicks, Eva Reutinger, Carlton Davidson, John Hall, and Jessica Payne - Council Liaison

Members Absent: Jamie Fleckenstein

Staff Present: Tom Schauer – Senior Planner and Taylor Graybehl – Senior Planner

Guests Present: Joan Buccino, Alexander Prentice, and Jose Lopez

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of Minutes

None

3. Citizen Comments

None

4. Action Item

- A. L 55-23: Landscape Plan Review, Best Western, 2035 & 2045 SW Hwy 99W, Tax Lot R4429BD02700

Senior Planner Schauer reviewed the updated landscape plan for Best Western on Hwy 99W. This application was before the Committee previously, and the Committee had asked for more information about the location of McMinnville Water & Light facilities, physical improvements and sidewalk, mature plant sizes, and updated plant list. The applicant had provided this information and staff recommended approval with revised conditions. He then reviewed the conditions for the trash enclosure, tree plantings, and screening on the south property line.

There was discussion regarding the plant species and screening options.

Jose Lopez, applicant, said they were thinking of putting in a 3-4 foot chain link fence for the screening if necessary and a concrete curb and parking bump to prevent cars from encroaching on the abutting property.

The Committee did not think the screening was needed, and agreed to remove Condition J. They also agreed the trash enclosure was properly screened and would be landscaped around it. They accepted staff's revisions to Conditions 3F, 3H, and 3I.

Committee Member Reutinger moved to approve L 55-23 with the revised conditions including removal of Condition J and revisions to Conditions 3F, 3H, and 3I. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Hall and passed unanimously.

B. L 6-24: Street Tree Removal, 2563 NW Alice Kelley, Tax Lot R4417BA03700

Senior Planner Graybehl explained the request for removal of two Maple trees on NW Alice Kelley Street due to the trees being in conflict with public improvements. He discussed the subject site, subdivision street tree plan, existing conditions, criteria, and additional comments received after the packet went out. Staff recommended denial due to insufficient information to show how the application met the criteria. A site visit was done on February 27 and staff found no public improvements were required to be repaired and there was no sidewalk uplift. The applicant showed there was a conflict in the past, but the conflicts were addressed without the removal of the trees.

The applicant said there was no root barrier installed when the sidewalk was repaired. If the trees were removed, he planned to replace them with two Autumn Blaze Maples. His neighbors had recently replaced their trees due to the same issues. He had already done the repairs to the sidewalk before applying to remove the trees.

The Committee discussed the benefits of removing the trees and replacing them with new trees to the City's standards. Committee Member Davidson encouraged the applicant to look at a different tree species because they would have the same issues if the root barrier didn't work.

The Committee found the criterion that the trees were in conflict with public improvements was being met due to the history of the site, types of trees, and other neighborhood replacements.

Committee Member Hall moved to approve L 6-24 with standard street tree removal conditions. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Reutinger and passed unanimously.

5. Committee Member Comments

Committee Member Davidson asked if the trash enclosure ordinance included recycling. Senior Planner Schauer said yes, it did.

6. Staff Comments

Senior Planner Schauer said the code amendments the Committee had worked on previously would be going back to the Planning Commission in April. He noted that in the code, reviews had to take place within 30 days of the submittal. Unfortunately, a decision the LRC made in February on an industrial development application was done after the 30 days. The applicant had appealed the decision to the Planning Commission and the appeal was approved based on the timeframe. The conditions the LRC placed on the application would not apply. Staff was working on making changes so this would not happen again.

7. Adjournment

Vice Chair Wicks adjourned the meeting at 1:05 p.m.