

**From:** P O'Leary <poleary847@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 4, 2020 11:28 AM  
**To:** Remy Drabkin; Adam Garvin; zack@branchgeary.com; Scott Hill; Kellie Menke; Sal Peralta; Wendy Stassens  
**Cc:** Heather Richards; Jeff Towery  
**Subject:** UGB Testimony

**This message originated outside of the City of McMinnville.**

---

There was discussion last night about the number of NACs. Heather had mentioned to me well over a year ago that Stafford had not been successful in figuring out a plan to make the commercial property at Baker Creek North viable after working on it for a year. I assume that's why that parcel has been on the market.

I did a quick search this morning and while I would not develop a business plan based on these numbers I would use them as an indicator for whether or not I should do more research or move onto the next idea.

On average, there are 0.17 grocery stores per 1,000 population, or very roughly, 5,900 people are required to support a smaller store (Fresh Harvest vs. WinCo).

Drug stores are in the range of 2.11 per 10,000 population.

Book stores are around 2 per 300,000.

The median number of coffee shops is 14 per 100,000 based on 104 markets covered.

In 2018, there were about 78 full service restaurants per 100,000 people. It is reasonable to assume that number has dropped considerably in the last several months.

Obviously, trade zones and other factors come into play. For example, the Laughing Bean or a 7-11 probably has a trade zone of 1 to 2 miles while a Walmart or a Trader Joes could easily be 50 miles. Another consideration is income and how much of the income is disposable. As I understand it, the NACs are to be located in R-5 zones.

McMinnville has a total population of 34,000. Even assuming a population of 44,000 tomorrow, it's questionable that more than one commercial NAC could be supported. Remember there is already a NAC at Second and Hill. From a marketing perspective, even prior to 2020, I would describe the Second and Hill NAC as surviving, but not necessarily thriving, particularly when you consider how long it has taken businesses to get established. And we already have retail space available (Penneys, Izzys, the Commissary for example) with more probably on the way unfortunately. We also need to acknowledge our existing business base and how much customer base those businesses can afford to lose.

I'm sure several people will consider this to be at the micro level. However, I think a realty check is always worth doing.

While I think this is something planning should have noted during the testimony from 1000 Friends last night, 17.21.010 (C) states that R-5 can be within 600 feet from a major collector or arterial or on a LOCAL COLLECTOR within 600 feet. That means a radius of at least 1200 feet even though planning has verbally confirmed a distance of 600 feet during the hearing. I think this is one of the items that needs to be carefully considered. Putting up to 30 density on a local collector will strain roads well past capacity. I don't think this item is required to be included in the remand for passage and should be removed. It can be considered when the TSP is updated.

The testimony from the farmer last night was particularly accurate and supported what the farmers said on the second night. Within one year of housing being built adjacent to his decades old orchard, he had to remove all his walnut trees. The neighboring dairy farms were also chased out because the new residents didn't like cow smell. Making developers provide adequate buffering to avoid the further loss of active farm land is critical.

I am concerned about the Framework and Area Plan portion of the remand. As I read it, it appears that outside, large scale developers are favored over our local developers because of the Master Plan requirement. Bringing in a Stafford or LGI, even though a few lots may be offered to local developers, ensures that local labor is not used. The level of complaints about the Baker Creek development compared to Cottonwood or the Bungalows should make it clear what style of development and housing McMinnville prefers.

Patty O'Leary