



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

Landscape Review Committee
ZOOM Online Meeting
Wednesday, August 18, 2021 - 12:00 PM

Please note that this meeting will be conducted via ZOOM meeting software due to the COVID-19 event.

Join ZOOM Meeting online via the following link:

<https://mcminnvilleoregon.zoom.us/j/82735554395?pwd=TGtRT01samxuUnVoSG5obXI0c0VjZz09>

Meeting ID: 827 3555 4395
Passcode: 345866

Or join ZOOM Meeting by phone via the following number: 1-253-215-8782

Committee Members	Agenda Items
John Hall, Chair	1. Call to Order
Rob Stephenson, Vice-Chair	2. Citizen Comments
Josh Kearns	3. Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none">Approval of Minutes – October 21, 2020 (<i>Exhibit 1</i>)
Patty Sorensen	4. Discussion Items <ul style="list-style-type: none">Development Code Revisions (<i>Exhibit 2</i>)
Carlton Davidson	5. Committee Member Comments
	6. Staff Comments
	7. Adjournment

The meeting site is accessible to handicapped individuals. Assistance with communications (visual, hearing) must be requested 24 hours in advance by contacting the City Manager (503) 434-7405 – 1-800-735-1232 for voice, or TDY 1-800-735-2900.

*Please note that these documents are also on the City's website, www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov. You may also request a copy from the Planning Department.



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

EXHIBIT 1 - 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.



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

EXHIBIT 2 - STAFF REPORT

DATE: August 18, 2021
TO: Landscape Review Committee Members
FROM: Amy Dixon, Contract Planner
SUBJECT: Code Amendments, Chapter 17.57, Landscaping, and Chapter 17.58, Trees

STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

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

OBJECTIVE/S: Define the unique character through a community process that articulates our core principles

Report in Brief:

This is a work session to discuss proposed amendments to Chapter 17.57 and 17.58 of the Zoning Code. Attached are recommendation on possible sections needing amended.

Background:

Landscape Review Committee (LRC) and staff have identified various sections that need amended for clarity of purpose, intent and implementation of the Chapters, ease of use by LRC, staff and the public, and establishing specific standards and guidelines.

Issues for Consideration and Discussion:

Because the Chapters regulate land use design and the Oregon legislation allows cities to adopt “reasonable local regulations relating to siting and design,” the McMinnville City Council, with recommendations from Landscape Review Committee and Planning Commission, will need to determine which standards best fit the community. Attached are staff recommendations for changes to these chapters for your consideration and discussion.

Next Steps:

There is no necessary formal Committee action as part of this work session. The Landscape Review Committee should convene a preliminary discussion about possible changes to the chapters that might best fit the community. It will be an opportunity to ask questions, provide feedback, and direct staff to proceed with drafting preliminary code amendments. Staff will then bring back the draft amendments for consideration as an action item at a future meeting.

AD

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
Chapter 17, Landscaping	17.57.010, Purpose and intent.		The purpose and intent of this Chapter is to encourage and, where appropriate, require the use of landscape elements, particularly plant materials, in proposed developments in an organized and harmonious manner that will enhance, protect and promote the economic, ecological and aesthetic environment of McMinnville.	The stated purpose and intent seems to need changed to be more inline with the requirements in the chapter.	Would need to create a new purpose and intent
			The City recognizes the value of landscaping in achieving the following objectives:	the wording on value of landscaping seems to be awkward and unclear.	Would need to possibly expound what this really means.
		A.	<p>Provide guidelines and standards that will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Reduce soil erosion and the volume and rate of discharge of storm water runoff. 2.Aid in energy conservation by shading structures from energy losses caused by weather and wind. 3.Mitigate the loss of natural resources. 4.Provide parking lot landscaping to reduce the harmful effects of heat, noise and glare associated with motor vehicle use. 5.Create safe, attractively landscaped areas adjacent to public streets. 6.Require the planting of street trees along the City's rights-of-way. 7.Provide visual screens and buffers that mitigate the impact of conflicting land uses to preserve the appearance, character and value of existing neighborhoods. 8.Provide shade, and seasonal color. 9.Reduce glare, noise and heat. 	The purpose and intent statement does not address impacts of climate change. Climate change is becoming a immense public concern. Vegetation provides means to counter act climate change.	Would need to possibly added a section identify climate change in the purpose/intent section

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
	17.57.040, Specific Uses Requiring Landscaping	A.	Churches, subject to the landscaping requirements of a multiple-family development when in a residential zone and subject to the landscaping requirements of a commercial development when in a zone other than residential;	The Sign Code requires Landscape Plans to be submitted when Signs are installed for churches within residential zone. This is unique to Churches in residential zones. There is very little landscaping that would be required but with a high cost of review and approval. It would service the public better if there were some established standards where staff would be able to approve administratively and therefore reduce cost and times to both staff and the public.	Would need to develop a set of very specific standards where staff review and approve. If deviating from the standards, LCR would review and approve.
	17.57.050 Plans - Submittal and review - Approval - Time limit for completion.	E.	All completed landscape projects shall be inspected by the Planning Director or their designee. Said projects shall be found to be in compliance with the approved plans prior to the issuance of an occupancy certificate for the structure, or prior to any security or portion thereof being refunded to the applicant. Minor changes in the landscape plan shall be allowed, as determined by the Planning Director or their designee, as long as they do not alter the character and aesthetics of the original plan	Staff relies on this language quite a bit during inspections. Staff has found with most landscape design projects, there can often be changes in site conditions during construction that require adjustment of the planting. Currently, availability of some plant materials has become an issue. Staff has become fairly flexible in approving field adjustments for these reasons as long as it does not alter the character or aesthetics of the original plan.	No changes are recommended
	17.57.060	B.	The location in which new plantings will be made and the	Without both common and	Would need to add language to

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
	Plans - Information to be included. The following information shall be included in the plans submitted under Section 17.57.050 :		variety (common or botanical name), and size of all new trees, shrubs, groundcover and lawns;	botanical names listed, it is sometimes unclear on the specific plant. Therefore difficult to determine size, height, or issues with environment, such as noxious or harmful to other animals.	require both common and botanical names.
				It is unclear what size the plant is at installation and maturity. This is information needed for review of the plans for spacing and location.	Would need to add language to require size of plants at installation and at maturity
		E.	All existing and proposed site features including walkways, graveled areas, patios, courts, fences, decks, foundations, potted trees, raised planters, or other open spaces so that the review committee may be fully knowledgeable of the project when discussing the application;	When fencing is used for screening, there is no requirement to submit information on type or height. This is needed to determine if the fence provide the necessary screening.	Would need to require information on fencing type, height and location on plans
		G.	All of the information on the plot plan for the building permit.	It is unclear as to what is required on a building permit. Therefore, plans may not included this information that LRC or staff needs to review the plans. Building permits are required to indicate scale, actual setback of building, all structures on site, location and use, topographical elevations, easements, complete address or street names, north direction arrow, and lot dimensions.	Would need to list the required information and add additional language to have all plants and parking spaces drawn to scale.

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
	17.57.070 Area Determination - Planning factors.	A. Landscaping shall be accomplished within the following ranges:	1. Industrial, at least seven percent of the gross area . This may be reduced to not less than five percent upon approval of the review committee. (The gross area to be landscaped may only be reduced by the review committee if there is a showing by the applicant that the intent and purpose of this chapter and subsection B of this section are met.)	It is unclear of the gross area refers to the gross area of the site or the development. If multiple phases, all the landscaping would be required to be install and most likely in area that will not be developed at time of phase approval or design. Without this being clarified, there is confusion on the public, staff and LRC.	Clarity is needed on gross area meaning. It would be appropriate that it would be based on what is being developed.
			2. Commercial, at least seven percent of the gross area. This may be reduced to not less than five percent upon approval of the review committee. (The gross area to be landscaped may only be reduced by the review committee if there is a showing by the applicant that the intent and purpose of this chapter and subsection B of this section are met.)		
			3. Multiple-family, twenty-five percent of the gross area. This may be reduced to not less than fifteen percent upon approval of the review committee. (The gross area to be landscaped may only be reduced by the review committee if there is a showing by the applicant that the intent and purpose of this chapter and subsection B of this section are met.)		
		B.	The following factors shall be considered by the applicant when planning the landscaping in order to accomplish the purpose set out in Section 17.57.010. The Landscape Review Committee shall have the authority to deny an application for failure to comply with any or all of these conditions: 1. Compatibility with the proposed project and the surrounding and abutting properties and the uses occurring thereon.	There are no clear and objective factors listed here. If these standard were more specific, staff might be able to review and approve small projects administratively to reduce time and cost to all. If deviating from the standards, it would be presented to LCR for review and approve. This could include reduction to minimum gross area	Would need to develop clear and objective standards in order to approve or deny due to failure to comply.

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
			<p>2. Screening the proposed use by sight-obscuring, evergreen plantings, shade trees, fences, or combinations of plantings and screens.</p> <p>3. The retention of existing trees and natural areas that may be incorporated in the development of the project. The existing grade should be preserved to the maximum practical degree. Existing trees shall be provided with a watering area equal to at least one-half the crown area.</p>	<p>of landscaping allowed in 17.57.070A 1-3</p>	
			<p>4. The development and use of islands and plantings therein to break up parking areas.</p>	<p>In additions to the comments above for this subsection, there are no standards for parking lot designs. This makes it hard to be consistent</p>	<p>In addition to comments above for this subsection, it would require development of parking lot and island requirements; such as having a maximum area of parking lot until it is physically and visually separated with landscaped planter islands and with a minimum width to provide the necessary plants.</p>
			<p>5. The use of suitable street trees in the development of new subdivisions, shopping centers and like developments. Certain trees shall be prohibited in parking areas: poplar, willow, fruit, nut, birch, conifer, and ailanthus.</p>	<p>See above comments for this subsection</p>	<p>See above comments for this subsection</p>

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
			6. Suitable watering facilities or irrigation systems must be included in or near all planted areas;	In addition to comments above for this subsection, It is unclear on what suitable watering facilities or irrigations system is. Some have proposed hand water. Maybe change to requiring permanent underground or drip irrigation system with an exemption for existing mature vegetation, drouth resistant plans with a water schedule. This would allow for water conservation opprotunities.	In addition to comments above for this subsection, the meaning of suitable watering facility needs to be established.
Chapter 17.58 Trees	17.58.020 Applicability	A.	Individual significant or historic trees as defined in this ordinance.	There are no definitions of what qualifies as “significant” or “historic” and there are no inventories of these types of trees.	Would need to define significant and historic trees. And maybe develop a process to have trees deemed historic.
		C.	All trees with trunks located completely within any private property which directly affect public infrastructure including but not limited to sewers, water mains, sidewalks, streets, public property, or clear vision distances at street intersections;	LRC have concerns that this infringes on private property rights.	This section would need to be removed.
		D.	All trees on developable land and subject to or undergoing development review such as site plan review, tentative subdivision review, or partition review;	A property could be cleared of all trees before development, where as there is no ability to save significant trees on the property.	Create tree removal limits on vacant land
				LRC has expressed concerns on the private property rights and regulating trees.	Need further discussion for possible direction.

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
	17.58.050 Review Criteria	C.	The proposed removal or pruning is part of an approved development project , a public improvement project where no alternative is available, or is part of a street tree improvement program.	The definition of Development Project needs to clarify the meaning	Would need to develop a more accurate definition.
				There have been a couple instances where, for, example, Public Works Engineering will approve a new curb cut/driveway access to a property as allowed by code where the new access requires removal of an otherwise healthy tree. But the tree has not been approved by LRC to be removed. May need to discuss with PW Engineering to require LRC approval prior to issuing a curb cut/driveway permit.	Need further discussion with Public Works for possible direction.
	17.58.075 Protection of Trees	A.	It shall be unlawful for any person to remove, destroy, break, or injure any street tree or public tree. Individuals convicted of removing or destroying a tree without City approval shall be subject to paying to the City an amount sufficient to fund the planting and establishment of a tree, or trees, of similar value.	This requirement has not been historically applied causing inequality with the public.	Need further discussion on enforcement direction
	17.58.080 Street Tree Planting - When Required		All new multi-family development, commercial or industrial development, subdivisions, partitions, or parking lots fronting on a public roadway which has a designated curb-side planting strip or planting island shall be required to plant street trees in accordance with the standards listed in Section 17.58.090.	There are no requirements for single-family residences, except if subject to an approved street tree plan. Many older neighborhoods fall into this situation. By adding single-family residences, it would provide an opportunity to acquire street trees in these older neighborhoods.	Would need to add single-family residences, not subject to an approved street tree plan

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
	17.58.090 Street Tree Standards	A.	The species of the street trees to be planted shall be chosen from the McMinnville Street Tree List, as approved by Resolution 2016-22 , unless approval of another species is given by the McMinnville Landscape Review Committee.	A new resolution was approved in 2019. By listing the Resolution number, it will be out dated every time a new resolution is approved. It would be better to not list the date of the resolution.	Would need to removed the resolution number.
		C.	Small or narrow stature trees (under 25 feet tall and less than 16 feet wide branching) should be spaced no greater than 20 feet apart; medium sized trees (25 feet to 40 feet tall, 16 feet to 35 feet wide branching) should be spaced no greater than 30 feet apart; and large trees (over 40 feet tall and more than 35 feet wide branching) should be spaced no greater than 40 feet apart.	Not all trees are the same grown width and height to be able to apply Spacing standards based on height and width of a tree.. Armstrong Maple can grow to 45 ft in height but only 15 feet wide. It would be classified as a small and large tree.	Would need to change this section to space based on either width or height
			Within residential developments, street trees should be evenly spaced, with variations to the spacing permitted as approved by the City for specific site limitations and safety purposes. Within commercial and industrial development staggered, or irregular spacing is permitted, as may be approved by the McMinnville Landscape Review Committee.	It tends to be the residential properties that have problems with evenly spacing due to the limited frontage of the property, where as, commercial and industrial zoned properties have the ability to adjust the trees and utilities to be more evenly installed.	Would need to change the residential property to be able to stagger the trees.
		D.	When located adjacent to a local residential street or minor collector street, street trees shall be planted within a curbside landscape strip measuring a minimum of three (3) feet in width.	There are more likely be issues in the future with installing a tree within a 3-foot wide planter strip. A 3-foot planter strip is very small to provide adequate room for growth. The smallest recommended planter strip width listed on the street tree list is 4 feet.	Would need to change the minimum to 4 feet to accommodate trees.

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
		E.	A. Street trees shall not be planted within ten (10) feet of fire hydrants, utility poles, sanitary sewer, storm sewer or water lines , or within twenty (20) feet of street light standards or street intersections, or within five (5) feet of a private driveway or alley. New utility poles shall not be located within five (5) feet of an existing street tree. Variations to these distances may be granted by the Public Works Director and as may be required to ensure adequate clear vision.	Some of these setbacks seem to be a little extreme. Many municipalities have setbacks from water meters that are less than 10 ft. The code allows variations granted by Public Works.	Would need to discuss with Public Works to see if these setbacks may be reduced as a standard.
		F.	Any street tree removed through demolition or construction within the street right-of-way, or as approved by the City, shall be replaced within the street right-of-way at a location approved by the city with a tree, or trees, of similar value	Usually the street trees removed are well established. This is a good basis for requiring larger-than-standard street trees for development-driven requests for removal.	Would need additional language to require larger street at installation.
	17.58.120 Street Tree Maintenance	A.	Street trees shall be continually maintained, including necessary watering, weeding, pruning and replacement, by the developer or property owner for one full growing season following planting, or as may be required by the City.	There is a disconnect when it comes to the public's knowledge of their responsibilities of street trees. Some type of educational effort to alert the public to their responsibilities vs. the City's would be beneficial for both trees and for staff. Maybe develop	Would need to discuss with Public Works to develop a program or webpage to assist owners.
		B.	Street tree plans, or landscape plans including street trees, shall be maintained in perpetuity. In the event that a street tree must be replaced, the adjacent property owner or developer shall plant a replacement tree of a species from the approved street tree or landscape plan.		
		C.	Maintenance of street trees, other than those located in the Downtown Tree Zone shall be the continuing obligation of the abutting property owner. The City shall undertake regular maintenance of street trees within the Downtown Tree Zone in accordance with appropriate horticultural practices including pruning and fertilizing to properly maintain the health of such trees.		

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
		D.	Street trees, as they grow, shall be pruned to provide at least eight (8) feet of clearance above sidewalks and thirteen (13) feet above local streets, fifteen (15) feet above collector streets, and eighteen (18) feet above arterial streets. This provision may be waived in the case of newly planted trees so long as they do not interfere with public travel, sight distances, or endanger public safety as determined by the City. Major pruning, as defined in Section 17.58.020, of a street tree must be approved by the City in accordance with Section 17.58.040.		
Misc.	Misc.			Staff would recommend that McMinnville develop an Urban Forestry Master Plan to help guide and shape policies for urban forest management and growth, health, maintenance, replacement strategy, etc. This can really help with some of the issues ; such as ensuring tree canopy equity, development and maintenance of a street tree/public tree inventory, diversity and health of the urban forest, updated planting standards.	Urban Forestry Master Plan would need to be developed.
				It is not clear on requirements or jurisdiction for public parks. Without clarification, requirements are imposed on the private property owners that are not on public property. This cause inequality between public and private sectors and on properties.	Work with Public Works to develop a Parks Maintenance & Tree Removal process similar to private parks and development sites.

Chapter	Code Section	Sub Section	Current Language	Issue	Solution
				There is not a program to assist owners with installing or replacement of Street Tree. Low income citizens may not be able to purchase or pay the fee for a tree replacement.	Develop a Street Tree Assistance Program