

Landscape Review Committee

**Community Development Center, 231 NE 5th Street
Wednesday, May 18, 2022 - 12:00 PM**

*Please note that this meeting will be conducted in-person and via
ZOOM.*

Join ZOOM Meeting online via the following link:

<https://mcminnvilleoregon.zoom.us/j/83002047920?pwd=eGxNV1hUNVZ0SIIMV29xeE55WkI0UT09>

Meeting ID: 830 0204 7920

Passcode: 340715

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
Patty Sorensen	3. Approval of Minutes A. August 18, 2021 (Exhibit 1)
Carlton Davidson	4. Discussion Items a. Elizabeth Chambers 455 NE Irvine St. Code enforcement action. Trees removed along western property line adjacent to the railroad. b. L 19-21, 3138 NE Rivergate. They did not pass street tree inspection. Looking for guidance.
Brian Wicks	5. Action Items
	6. Committee Member Comments
	7. Staff Comments
	8. 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

MINUTES

August 18, 2021
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

12:00 pm
ZOOM Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Carlton Davidson, John Hall, and Patty Sorenson

Members Absent: Josh Kearns and Rob Stephenson

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director and Amy Dixon – Contract Planner

Guests Present:

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Action Item

- Approval of Minutes – October 21, 2020

Committee Member Davidson moved to approve the October 21, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Chair Hall and passed 3-0.

4. Discussion Items

- Development Code Revisions

Contract Planner Dixon reviewed the purpose and intent language of the landscape chapter. It did not seem to be in line with the requirements of the chapter. There was consensus to list out the requirements in the chapter and then coordinate it into the purpose and intent. This section would be done at the end when they would have a better idea of what direction they were going in.

Contract Planner Dixon discussed the next sentence about the value of landscaping which was awkward and unclear. It should be expounded on what this really meant. The list of guidelines and standards did not transfer to the criteria. She thought changes should be made to the criteria and then the list could be updated. The next section was about churches and if they had a sign, they would need to have landscaping around it, which was unique to this particular use and it was a lot

of process to go through for a small amount of landscaping. Staff thought it would be better to establish standards where staff would be able to approve these administratively. If the applicant deviated from the standards, the LRC would need to review and approve it.

Planning Director Richards discussed the fee structure and how much it cost applicants to go through this process. She also read language in the sign code for church signs. She thought the sign review for churches should be removed and the LRC could decide if churches should go through a landscape review process for new development.

There was consensus to remove the language from the sign code and review the whole property when it came in for development.

Contract Planner Dixon then discussed the language about inspections of landscape projects. Staff had found that for some projects there had been changes during construction that required adjustment of the planting. Staff was fairly flexible in approving field adjustments as long as it did not alter the character or aesthetics of the original plan. She did not recommend any changes. The Committee agreed it needed to stay flexible.

Contract Planner Dixon said the next section had to do with the location of the new plantings and the variety and size of the new plantings. Sometimes it was unclear what the specific plant being proposed was, therefore making it difficult to determine the size, height, or issues with the environment. It was also unclear what size the plant was at installation and maturity. She recommended requiring both the common and botanical name of the plants and to add language to require the size of the plants at installation and at maturity. There was agreement to go with staff's recommendation.

Contract Planner Dixon said another issue was when fencing was used as screening, there was no requirement to submit the type or height of the fence. She suggested adding a requirement that fencing type, height, and location would be on the landscape plans.

There was discussion regarding the current standards for fences. The Committee was in agreement with staff's recommendation.

Contract Planner Dixon said it was unclear what was required on a building permit. She thought that information should be listed and that language be added to have all plants and parking spaces drawn to scale. The Committee agreed.

Contract Planner Dixon said for the determining factors, in industrial and commercial it was at least 7% of the gross area needed to be landscaped, and for multi-family it was 25% of the gross area. It was unclear if the gross area referred to the gross area of the site or the development, especially if there were multiple phases. It would be appropriate that it would be based on what was being developed.

There was discussion regarding designing the whole site, but then developing it in phases. If the applicant could not meet the approved plan or wanted to change it in the future, they could come back to the LRC.

There was consensus to wait until Committee Member Stephenson could weigh in on the decision.

5. Committee Comments

None

6. Staff Comments

None

7. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 1:01 p.m.