

From: [P.O"Leary](#)
To: [Adam Garvin](#); [Kellie Menke](#); [Remy Drabkin](#); [Sal Peralta](#); [Scott Hill](#); [Wendy Stassens](#); [Zack Geary](#)
Cc: [Heather Richards](#); [Jeff Towery](#)
Subject: UGB Testimony
Date: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 11:13:12 PM

This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.

Following the public testimony of the UGB remand process for the past two evenings has been enlightening. I thought the very first public comment, from the representative of the **PORTLAND Building Association** applauding our McMinnville planning department, to be curious. Maybe he's looking forward to sending mailers to Hillsboro and surrounding areas on behalf of McMinnville just as LGI has done. I do have samples and I'm willing to share McMinnville's unique position in the "greater Portland area."

Also, I apparently didn't understand Mr. Al Ashcroft's testimony last night. I thought he said that conducting a decision process of this magnitude during the pandemic was questionable, particularly for those people, like himself, that found technology challenging. I must have missed his request for a listing of the advertisements run in the newspaper. I did hear his query about approaching land needs on a regional level, seconded by Jennifer tonight. But neither request was referred to the Lane County regional land use planning noted by EcoNorthwest. I am glad that the News-Register got the advertising revenue though. "Buy Local" should always be supported.

Last night, Mr. Sid Friedman inquired about high density housing location and his inquiry was followed up by Councilor Peralta's comments about high density housing along corridors that have planned transit routes. Yet any turnouts - not actual transit stops - along Baker Creek and Hill Roads that could have been built at the developer's expense were vetoed by planning. But I'm sure transit is a high priority for high density development by planning. They said so.

Councilor Peralta followed up with a question about R-1 housing on sloped land, only to be told that that was too detailed for this level of discussion. Yet high density housing and NACs were diagrammed and a Long Range Planning slide tonight listed Zoning Ordinances and Area Planning three levels down at the micro level. So where is the line of demarcation for 30,000 feet and micro level?

It might be at the same place as the TSP that swapped Three Mile traffic with southwest McMinnville traffic - you know, access to 18 versus getting around Michelbook Golf Course and Cozine ravine are clearly interchangeable. That's probably the same TSP that was supposed to be updated to remain in effect, yet never was updated. Makes me warm and fuzzy that it will actually be enforced now.

I am pleased that we are getting credit for all the high density housing we've built

since 2003, meaning from 2016 to now, since building was non-existent from 2008 to 2016. But I'm sure we're building at the same levels as always according to our planning director tonight, even though 2016 had, what was the figure in the newspaper? 99 permits? But does that 900 unit figure include the 120 multi-family capacity approved for the Baker Creek North commercial land currently for sale? Since I love to gamble, my money is on "no."

I'm also sure removing any buffering requirements is logical. I know from personal experience that people would rather cross Hill Road with their children during commute times than use the Linear Park one block away. So clearly Hill Road is an adequate buffer for the Linear Park. Tonight, I know Jennifer was happy to learn that Cozine Creek was a natural barrier between farming and housing. I'm sure she'll be happy to contribute her farm land to make developers more profitable. Do you people not listen to what you are told? With at least 28 acres in question, at \$10,000 (it should be closer to \$25,000) per acre for farmland adjacent but not included in the UGB, our UGB consultant granted Jennifer the right to tithe \$280,000 of land value to the City of McMinnville for a buffer to a developer. But that acreage **will** be included in the UGB. Would any of you do contribute \$280,000-\$700,000?

I have pages more of sarcastic comments, but let's cut to the meat.

1. The remand only needs to list what the average density per acre needs to be. Don't pass anything else that McMinnville needs to live with until you understand what the implications are. Currently, you're making McMinnville a density donut with no transportation solutions. A clear definition of 30,000 feet view and micro level needs to be determined and upheld.
2. Buffering zones need to stay in place and the developers need to be responsible for the buffers, not the farmers.
3. Third Street McMinnville is your original NAC yet you are moving density away from the core. So Third Street will be come tourist dependent. Tell me, how is that working so far?
4. You are piling density into the west side of McMinnville yet all the medical services are in the east. Tell me how well that works for you when your kid is bleeding out from an injury or your significant other has a heart attack.

I'm not arguing the land (be grateful), but you do need to seriously consider what you absolutely must pass to get to land versus what planning is asking you to commit to for codes, ordinances and policies. At the absolute most, the only thing you should be considering are policies, but definitely not codes or ordinances. Planning is controlling the deadlines and planning is controlling the information you receive. Planning reports to you. Don't forget that.

Patty O'Leary