



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

Landscape Review Committee
Hybrid In-Person & ZOOM Online Meeting
Wednesday, January 21, 2026 - 12:00 PM

*Please note that this meeting will be conducted in-person at the
McMinnville Community Development Center, 231 NE Fifth Street, and via ZOOM.*

Join ZOOM Meeting online via the following link:

<https://mcminnvilleoregon.zoom.us/j/88138973805?pwd=dPNSRKb5dMDeGssb2682IKX3j3iMVq.1>
Meeting ID: 881 3897 3805 Passcode: 766657

Or join ZOOM Meeting by phone via the following number: 1-669-444-9171

Committee Members	Agenda Items
Brian Wicks	1. Call to Order and Roll Call
Carlton Davidson	2. Minutes – July 16, 2025 (Exhibit 1); December 3, 2025 (Exhibit 2)
Lee McCollins (Chair)	3. Citizen Comments
Eva Reutinger	4. Action Items A. Exhibit 3 – 2026 LRC Work Plan
Vacant	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 Division.



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

MINUTES

July 16, 2025
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

12:00 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Brian Wicks, Eva Reutinger, and Lee McCollins

Members Absent: Jamie Fleckenstein, Carlton Davidson, and Jessica Payne – Council Liaison

Staff Present: Taylor Graybehl – Senior Planner, David Berniker – Planning Manager, Heather Richards – Community Development Director and Tom Schauer – Senior Planner

Guests Present: Nancy Pierce, Trevor Synkelma, and Kirsti Hauswald, Joe Schiewe (all representing Holt Homes) and Jeff Creele

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Taylor Graybehl called the meeting to order at 12:00 pm.

2. Citizen Comments

None.

3. Action Items

A. Hillcrest Phases 7 & 8 - Review of Applicant's Request for Reduction in Tree Planting Size Requirement to Qualify for Tree Removal Mitigation, Revised Landscape Plans

Senior Planner Schauer presented the Staff report on the request to count trees smaller than the required 1.5-inch caliper size as mitigation trees and reduce the originally proposed number of mitigation trees in the Revised Landscape Plan for Hillcrest Phases 7 and 8. Staff did not find the burden of proof had been met to demonstrate that mitigation would be better met by reducing the size or number of qualifying mitigation trees.

Community Development Director Richards explained the Applicant had provided a fee-in-lieu deposit for **non**-qualifying mitigation trees to be reconciled as qualifying mitigation efforts were credited. Only ten percent of the trees in the proposed Landscape Plan would meet the 1.5-inch caliper size requirement.

Questions and comments were addressed about differences between the most recent Hillcrest application submitted on June 30, 2025 and earlier submittals; tree standards being measured by caliper size according to Code, not container gallons; having clear and objective standards for the future, including further phases of this development; the \$550 fee-in-lieu for mitigation trees; potential lack of availability of certain trees above 1.5-inch caliper size; and requiring tree mitigation to be completed during each phase of development.

Kristi Hauswald, AKS Engineering and Forestry, stated nursery stock availability of 1.5-inch caliper native trees was limited, but smaller sizes were available in higher quantities. She shared photographs of trees in the smaller proposed sizes and described the benefits of planting smaller trees including faster growth and less site disturbance.

Questions and comments were addressed about possibly protecting small trees by wrapping, staking, or putting browse protection in place; assessing the survival rate of mitigation trees in future years; potential to increase the percentage of qualifying 1.5-inch caliper size trees by using alternate species; specifying plant sizes and species in the Landscape Plan that were reasonably available; potential to plant the trees during the fall of 2025; and anticipating completion of Hillcrest Phase 7 in fall 2025 and Phase 8 in summer 2026.

Committee members discussed concerns about allowing 0.5-inch caliper size trees to qualify as mitigation trees, noting small trees were at higher risk of damage from browsing deer, wind, and over or under watering. The importance of not setting a precedent for accepting trees smaller than the Code required was acknowledged. More information was needed before the Committee could consider allowing conifer trees to qualify as mitigation trees.

Committee Member McCollins moved to deny the request for trees smaller than 1.5-inch caliper to qualify as mitigation trees. Committee Member Reutinger seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0. (Ayes: McCollins, Reutinger, and Wicks. Nays: None.)

Staff and Committee members encouraged the Applicants to return when planting trees for Hillcrest Phases 7 and 8 to request an exception if availability of trees over 1.5-inch caliper was still an issue. Staff confirmed trees larger than 1.5-inch caliper would qualify as mitigation trees.

Joe Schiewe stated the Landscape Plan would be revised to show all trees at 1.5-inch caliper.

Community Development Director Richards stated according to new rules in the Code, amended Landscape Plans would be approved by Staff if clear and objective standards were met and be reviewed by the Committee if discretionary decision-making was needed.

B. Street Tree Plan and Landscape Plan Review for “The West Side” (Baker Creek North Mixed-Use) Planned Development, Tax Lot R4418 00100 (1978-1994 Baker Creek Road)

This item was continued to the August 2025 meeting.

4. Discussion Items

A. Street Tree List Amendment

Senior Planner Schauer asked for two Committee members to volunteer to meet to discuss standards for trees on the Street Tree List, expand the number of species listed, and potentially assemble care instructions for each tree. Committee Member Wicks volunteered to meet and suggested contacting Committee Member Davidson to utilize his expertise in tree species.

The Committee discussed possibly offering public education outreach regarding tree planting and care after Street Tree List amendments were complete to increase street tree success. It was noted that the City’s tree planting diagrams needed to be updated.

5. Committee Member Comments

Not addressed.

6. Staff Comments

Not addressed.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 pm.



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

MINUTES

December 3, 2025
Landscape Review Committee
Regular Meeting

5:00 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Brian Wicks, Eva Reutinger, Jamie Fleckenstein, and Lee McCollins

Members Absent: Carlton Davidson

Staff Present: Taylor Graybehl – Senior Planner, David Berniker – Planning Manager

Guests Present: City Council Liaison Jessica Payne

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Fleckenstein called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. Minutes

- a. February 7, 2024
- b. September 11, 2024
- c. October 23, 2024
- d. December 4, 2024
- e. December 18, 2024
- f. January 15, 2025
- g. January 22, 2025
- h. February 19, 2025
- i. March 19, 2025
- j. April 9, 2025
- k. May 12, 2025

Committee Member McCollins moved to approve all of the above sets of minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Wicks and passed unanimously 4-0.

3. Citizen Comments

None

4. Action Items

a. Natural Resources Draft Code Amendments

Senior Planner Graybehl gave the LRC an update on the City's Natural Resources planning effort under Oregon Land Use Goal 5, initiated as part of the recent Urban Growth Boundary amendment. He explained the work that had been done so far, compliance with Oregon Land Use Goals, Great Neighborhood Principles and Statewide Planning Goals, recommended Natural Resources Protection Program, and significant natural resources in the City. He then discussed creating a riparian protection subdistrict and map of riparian corridor locations, where the standards would apply, what was allowed currently, and proposed development standards. These standards included requirements for development applications, vegetation disturbance and restoration requirements, flexibility options, and top-of-bank determination.

There was discussion regarding how there could be some lots in the riparian corridor that did not have the floodplain zoning associated with them, Planning Commission approval instead of LRC approval for Conditional Use/Variance applications, LRC making recommendations to the Planning Commission, clarification that it was a 1:1 restoration ratio for native vegetation and 1:1.5 restoration ratio for non-native plants.

The Committee suggested changing it to: if disturbing non-native plants, restore non-native plants with 1:1 native vegetation and if disturbing native plants, replace the native 1:1.5. They wanted to disincentivize disturbing established native plants, and if non-native plants were removed, they could be replaced with a lesser square footage of native plants.

Senior Planner Graybehl reviewed the updates to the Landmark/Significant Trees Chapter 17.58 "Trees," tree grove inventory that was done by the consultants, when the standards would apply, what was currently allowed, proposed development standards including requirements for development applications and tree replacement ratios, protection requirements, and flexibility options.

There was discussion regarding replacement ratios for the non-native trees and native trees and how the size of the tree made a difference for replacement. Currently it was a 1:1 replacement, but the Committee would like to see it scaled. It was suggested to plant 1 tree per 6 inches removed, and 2 trees per 9 inches removed. There was further discussion about a different ratio for native trees, pushback on protecting trees on private property, how the development standards applied to the critical root zone, and adding a provision for an agricultural grove.

Senior Planner Graybehl explained how they had strengthened the tree protections for public and private property in the UGB. Two new tree categories had been created, landmark trees and significant trees. For significant trees, one tree per six inches of removed trees was required outside subdistricts and a one to one replacement was required within NH-P, NH-M, TG-P, and RC-P zones.

It was suggested to add a criterion for historic significance of a tree that might not meet the diameter or size criteria. This would be included as a work plan item.

The Committee thought they should change the replacement requirement from plant one replacement tree per 6" to one tree per 6" and one additional tree per every additional 3". There

was further discussion regarding a mitigation fee if all the trees could not be replaced on the property and what other cities' fees were.

It was questioned why there was a lesser replacement standard for trees in the protection zones. Removing a significant or landmark tree would come to the LRC if it was part of a landscape plan seeking discretionary review. Any work in a tree grove or riparian corridor would not be brought to the LRC unless it was a recommendation to the Planning Commission. For the most part, removing trees would be a staff decision.

There was discussion about alternative proposals, like creating a native rain garden instead of replanting trees, would come to the LRC, but staff questioned what the review criteria would be in those instances. In most cases, people would pay the fee if they couldn't replant. There was further discussion about considering private property owner rights and not applying the standards to private residential property. Staff noted the purpose of the code amendments was to protect the tree canopy, especially for larger trees. The question was who did that apply to.

There was consensus that 10,000 square foot lots or smaller of private property could remove one tree per year. The focus was on groves and significant and landmark trees.

Staff would go back and look at where the replacement numbers were coming from. It was noted the development threshold this applied to, new development, seemed appropriate, and the exemption of removing one significant tree per residential lot per year would remove a lot of onus and still not allow clearcutting.

The LRC would meet on December 29 to complete the discussion on the replacement requirements for tree groves and significant and landmark trees. They were on board with the process and methodology of the amendments.

The Committee thought the numbers for replacement should consider a scale that recognized the value of a larger tree was not linear and the replacement should reflect that.

Senior Planner Graybehl discussed the amendment to scenic viewpoint and viewsheds, Chapter XI "Natural Resources." He explained the scenic views draft program summary where analysis would be required for area plans with a scenic viewpoint to protect the viewshed. He discussed the inventory of scenic viewpoints and recommended policies and alternatives for limiting uses that conflicted with scenic viewpoint/viewshed protection. He then reviewed the next steps.

5. Committee Member Comments

None

6. Staff Comments

None

7. Adjournment

Chair Fleckenstein adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

EXHIBIT 3 - STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 21, 2026
TO: Landscape Review Committee Members
FROM: Taylor Graybehl, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Agenda Item – 2026 LRC Work Plan

STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

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

OBJECTIVE/S: Strategically plan for short and long-term growth and development that will create enduring value for the community

Report in Brief:

This item aims to discuss and adopt a targeted Work Plan for the 2026 calendar year to guide the Landscape Review Committee's activities. The plan should include short-term and long-term impact projects, strategies to maintain Tree City USA status (including Arbor Day event, tree planting, and proclamation), and enhanced community outreach.

Background:

Purpose of the Landscape Review Committee

The Landscape Review Committee (LRC) exists to enhance the appearance of McMinnville by encouraging quality landscaping that promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the public. This purpose is established in the McMinnville Municipal Code.

Guiding Policies and Values

The LRC Work Plan should align with the following guiding documents:

1. **McMinnville Municipal Code**
 - o Chapter 2.33 – Landscape Review Committee
 - Purpose (§2.33.010):
To ensure that the appearance of the city of McMinnville is enhanced by

encouraging quality landscaping which will benefit and protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public. (Ord. 5028 §1, 2017).

- Responsibilities (\$2.33.020):
The LRC serves in an advisory role to the Planning Director, Planning Commission, and City Council on:
 - Land-use application reviews
 - Comprehensive plan policies
 - Zoning ordinance amendments related to landscaping and trees

2. MAC-TOWN 2032 Strategic Plan

- Goal: Guide growth and development strategically, responsively, and responsibly to enhance McMinnville's unique character.
- Objective: Educate and build support for innovative and creative solutions.
- Priority Action: Develop a social media strategy to inform and engage the community.

Recent Work Plan History

From **2020 through 2023**, the LRC adopted annual work plans to guide its efforts. In **2025**, a new work plan was implemented with several key accomplishments:

- **Code Updates:**
 - Chapter 17.57 (*Landscaping*)
 - Chapter 17.58 (*Trees*)
- **Tree City USA Maintenance:**
 - Hosted Arbor Day event
 - Issued proclamation
 - Conducted social media outreach
- **Natural Resources Protection Program:**
 - Contributed to review and refinement; program scheduled to take effect in 2026
- **Street Tree Planting and Design Standards:**
 - Updated planting and design specifications with committee input

Below is the **2025 Work Plan**, showing completed items (~~struck-through~~), and ongoing items (**highlighted**).

McMinnville Landscape Review Committee - 2025 Work Plan					
GOAL : Evaluate & Enhance the McMinnville's Urban Forest & Landscape					
Strategy	Action	Priority	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Conduct a Comprehensive Inventory of McMinnville's Street Trees	Develop/Recommend Plan for Implementation	Medium	Winter 2025	Staff/\$	City of McMinnville (City)/Landscape Review Committee (LRC)
Update Tree Regulations to Limit Future Impacts on Public Facilities	Update the Street Tree Planting Design and Drawing Specifications	High	Spring 2025	Staff	LRC/City
	Update McMinnville Street Tree List	High	Summer 2025	Staff	LRC/City
Amend Tree Chapter of McMinnville Zoning Ordinance	Recommend amendments for Street Tree separation standards from public facilities	Medium	Winter 2025	Staff	City/LRC
GOAL: Increase Awareness & Appreciation of McMinnville's Urban Forest & Landscape					
Strategy	Action	Priority	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Celebrate Arbor Day in McMinnville	Promote Arbor Day Events in McMinnville	High	Spring 2025	Staff	LRC/City
	Coordinate Arbor Day Tree Planting Event	High	Spring 2025	Staff/\$	LRC/City
Engage and Educate the Community	Develop and Implement Outreach Plan	Medium	Spring 2025	Staff	LRC/City
GOAL: Preserve McMinnville's Urban Forest & Landscape					
Strategy	Action	Priority	Timeframe	Cost	Responsibility
Manage Existing Landscape and Trees	Provide Recommendations and Guidance for Natural Features Management Program	High	Summer 2025	Staff	City/LRC
Maintain and Expand Street Tree Canopy Coverage	Explore and recommend programs for Street Tree replacement assistance.	High	Fall 2025	Staff	City/LRC
Protect Significant and Historic Trees	Identify significant and historic trees.	Medium	Fall 2025	Staff/\$	City/LRC

A **draft of the 2026 Work Plan** is attached for discussion.

Discussion:

Staff Recommendation: Focused 2026 Work Plan

Staff recommends streamlining the Work Plan to concentrate on four key areas for maximum impact and efficiency:

1. Long-Term Project

Landscape Code Amendments (or other code updates)

- Landscape Chapter (Priority):**

During City Council's adoption of the Landscape Code, additional updates were requested. Staff seeks clarification on whether the Landscape Review Committee wishes to pursue these updates in 2026.

- **Priority:** Medium
- **Time frame:** March to ? (minimum 7 months)
- **Cost:** Staff resources, mailings, notices
- **Responsibility:** Staff lead, LRC support

- **Tree Chapter (Optional/Low Priority):**

Consider revising chapter structure, tree protection requirements, and street tree planting standards. This item could be added if capacity allows.

- **Priority:** Low
- **Time frame:** After Landscape Code Amendment
- **Cost:** Staff resources, mailings, notices
- **Responsibility:** Staff lead, LRC support

2. Short-Term Project

McMinnville Street Tree List Update

- Staff has begun updating the Street Tree List. This project was identified by both the Committee and staff to prevent planting species that could cause long-term negative impacts on infrastructure and urban canopy health.
 - **Priority:** High
 - **Time frame:** May to August (4 months)
 - **Cost:** Staff resources
 - **Responsibility:** LRC lead, staff support

Optional Project

- Consider option project.

3. Maintain Tree City USA Status

To retain this designation, the City must:

- Host an **Arbor Day celebration**
- Issue an **official proclamation**
 - **Priority:** High
 - **Time frame:** February to April, November to December (5 months)
 - **Cost:** Outreach materials, staff resources
 - **Responsibility:** Staff lead, LRC support

4. Community Outreach and Education

- Consider **development and implementation of outreach plan**
- Explore updates to the **City website**
- Create **educational materials**
- Develop **social media content**
- Participate in **community events** to raise awareness and engagement
 - **Priority:** High
 - **Time frame:** February to December
 - **Cost:** Outreach materials, staff resources
 - **Responsibility:** Staff lead, LRC support

Each action will be evaluated based on **priority, timeframe, cost, and responsibility**. If additional items can be added during 2026 due to early completion of existing tasks, they may be incorporated.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Draft 2026 Landscape Review Committee Work Plan

Fiscal Impact:

The City will pursue grant opportunities to help fund projects and activities outlined in the Work Plan.

Additional tasks may need to be completed in-kind by City staff, depending on workload capacity. Limited funds may also be allocated for the creation of outreach materials and to support the Arbor Day celebration.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Landscape Review Committee adopt a 2026 Work Plan for the Landscape Review Committee after discussing the draft Work Plan and deliberating.

Suggested Motion: "That the Landscape Review Committee adopt the 2026 Work Plan as provided by staff"

TG

DRAFT - 2026 Landscape Review Committee Work Plan													
Items	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Priority	Lead
Long -Term													
Landscape Code Amendment												Medium	Staff/LRC
Tree Chapter												Low	Staff/LRC
Short-Term													
Street Tree List Update												High	LCR/Staff
Maintain Tree City USA												High	Staff/LRC
Arbor Day Event Proclamation												High	LCR/Staff
Submit Application												High	Staff/LRC
Community Outreach and Education													
Develop Outreach Plan												Medium	LCR/Staff
Farmers Market												Medium	Staff/LRC
Implement Outreach Plan												Medium	LCR/Staff