

DATE: March 19, 2019
TO: HNA, BLI, HS Project Advisory Committee
CC: Heather Richards and Tom Schauer, City of McMinnville
FROM: Bob Parker and Sadie DiNatale, ECONorthwest
SUBJECT: PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #5 SUMMARY

PAC Meeting Summary

This memorandum summarizes the McMinnville's Buildable Lands Inventory, Housing Needs Analysis, and Housing Strategy Project Advisory Committee Meeting #5. The meeting took place on March 7, 2019 at 4pm to 6pm at McMinnville's Police Training Room.

The summary follows the meeting agenda.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:00pm.

PAC Meeting #3 Notes

The PAC approved meeting notes, as amended, with these comments:

- Recollection that PAC did not conclude to exclude high landslide susceptibility constraints (only very high susceptibility). Consultant team and City to discuss.
- One member requested tabular data of the Buildable Land Inventory. Consultant team will work with City to upload the database to the project website.

Project Update

Bob Parker provided a brief overview of what the consultant team has worked on since PAC meeting #3. The following topics were discussed:

- **Joint CC/PAC Meeting.** Heather Richards discussed going to City Council to make a request to amend the existing ECONorthwest contract to include an Economic Opportunities Analysis and Urbanization Study. Richards invited the committee to continue serving on the PAC (potentially with some additional members). PAC members were okay with continuing to serve.
- **Focus Group #1 Results.** No comments.
- **Public Workshop #1 Results.** No comments.
- **PAC Comments.** Included:
 - One member commented on neighborhood perceptions in that, focus group findings identified neighborhood perceptions as a barrier to development, but the public in attendance at the open house appeared to accept the need for affordable housing. The member commented that this could be a hopeful sign.

-
- One member suggested a modification to the next public meeting sign-in sheet so that attendees could identify whether they live in McMinnville or not.
 - One member commented that many retirees are moving here and wondering if the community is safe. They are concerned that the growth of larger cities will follow them to neighborhoods in McMinnville. There could be a perception that a larger lot means a safer neighborhood.
 - One member commented that multifamily homeownership products (e.g. condos) are missing in the McMinnville housing market. Demand may increase for these housing types in the future. Cottage clusters sounded like a good idea for the condo model as well.

Planning for McMinnville's Future Neighborhoods

Richards discussed the future of housing in McMinnville's neighborhoods, which related to a PowerPoint presentation and memorandum provided by the City in the PAC meeting materials. Richards explained that the current planning system is not meeting all of McMinnville's housing needs. Richards mentioned the key role of the PAC in shaping the housing strategy would be to consider ways that support housing choices and housing quality while protecting McMinnville's small-town charm as growth continues to occur.

Richards mentioned that McMinnville's Great Neighborhood principles would go to Council in April. The neighborhood principles relevant to the housing strategy discussions are: (1) housing for diverse incomes, (2) housing variety, and (3) human scale design.

Richards explained that McMinnville must plan for single-family detached, single-family attached, multifamily housing but that there are many, diverse housing typologies within these three categories. Richards also explained that increased density does not always improve affordability and that technical assumptions do not always play out in reality.

The intent of this discussion was to prep the PAC for their recommendations about housing mix, housing density, redevelopment, and policy directions.

BLI and HNA Discussion and Recommendations

Parker outlined discussion objectives (i.e. PAC decisions about housing mix, housing density, infill/redevelopment, and policy direction).

The rights-of-way (ROW) conversion factor (to get from net acres to gross acres in the capacity portion of the analysis) was briefly discussed prior to PAC recommendations. PAC member inquired whether a smaller ROW conversion factor would alleviate development costs and influence housing affordability. Smaller ROW would also reduce land need. Richards mentioned that the City has already taken steps to reduce street standards. The PAC did not decide to reduce the conversion factor in the technical analysis at this time.

-
- PAC recommended, by majority vote¹, to use a 55/45 housing mix split: 55% single-family detached housing, 12% single-family attached housing, and 33% multifamily housing. Also discussed were a 50/50 split and 60/40 split, but they had less support than the majority supported 55/45 split.
 - PAC recommended, by majority vote², to pursue a policy direction that eliminates Euclidean zoning.
 - PAC recommended, by majority vote³, an 8% redevelopment/infill assumption. The suggested 6% assumption was deemed too low.
 - PAC indicated they were okay⁴ with the consultant team deducting land needed to accommodate housing before 2021 from McMinnville’s buildable residential land.
 - A recommendation about average density was not determined at this meeting. That said, by nature of the new housing mix assumptions, average housing density would increase accordingly.

Housing Strategy Discussion

The PAC indicated that the suggested strategic priorities were an okay place to start.

Old/New Business

None

Comments

None

Next Steps

The PAC will meet with City staff to continue talking about the recommendations and housing strategy. This meeting is not yet scheduled. The final PAC meeting with the consultant team is also not yet scheduled.

In the interim, the consultant team will revise the analysis based on the PACs direction and continue shaping the housing strategy.

¹ **Housing Mix:** Nobody voted for existing mix (ACS), 2 people voted for historic housing mix (permit database), 1 person voted for Scenario 1 (60/40 split), and 8 people voted for Scenario 2 (55/45 split). A PAC member suggested the committee vote on a 50/50 split; it received 5 votes.

² **Policy Direction:** Nobody voted for existing Euclidean approach, 3 people voted for Great Neighborhoods approach, 3 people voted for hybrid high density approach, and 3 people voted for hybrid high- and low-density approach.

³ **Redevelopment/Infill:** 8 people voted for 8%.

⁴ **Deducting land need:** no formal vote, general consensus.