



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

February 20, 2020
Planning Commission
Work Session Meeting

5:30 pm
McMinnville Civic Hall, 200 NE 2nd Street
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Commissioners: Susan Dirks, Gary Langenwaller, Roger Lizut, Amanda Perron, Beth Rankin, and Lori Schanche

Members Absent: Robert Banagay and Erin Butler

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director and Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

1. Call to Order

Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Discussion

A. Residential Site & Design Review Update

Senior Planner Darnell gave an overview of HB 2001. The House Bill required cities with a population over 25,000 to allow for the development of middle housing in the same areas where single family detached dwellings were allowed and allow a duplex on each lot or parcel zoned for residential use. Middle housing included duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, cottage clusters, and townhouses. What that meant for McMinnville was a change to five residential zones to allow the middle housing types. Cities were required to adopt land use regulations and Comprehensive Plan amendments to address these new requirements by June 30, 2022. There was some language to allow for an extension of the deadline due to infrastructure issues and the extension request was due by June 30, 2021.

Planning Director Richards said it was a tough lift for cities of McMinnville's size. There were some funds associated with the House Bill that cities could apply for and staff planned to apply. The City would need to do an analysis to see what it meant for water, wastewater, and transportation infrastructure. If they had deficiencies, it would not exempt them from moving forward with the House Bill's intent. They would have to come up with solutions and how long it would take to solve. There was a rule making committee currently meeting that was defining what a reasonable timeframe would be in terms of money, resources, and time. The City did not have the funds to do the work, and wanted to be an early adopter for funding. Staff would be working on the infrastructure piece over the next year.

Senior Planner Darnell said the rulemaking process was ongoing right now and that process would clarify some of the language in the House Bill and more specifically prescribe what the requirements were and how they were carried out. They also intended to create a model code that would be used if a City did not adopt their own code and regulation amendments by the

deadline. The House Bill requirements aligned with a lot of the work the City had already been doing with encouraging a variety of housing types and forms and Great Neighborhood Principles. Staff had been working with a consultant to develop the design standards for the types of middle housing required. The final first draft would be completed by the end of March and it would be brought back to the Commission for review. Tonight he planned to introduce the topic and the more specific details would be discussed later. The focus for how the code would be structured would be a table of uses in the code that specified which housing types were allowed in which zones. There would also be design standards that applied to those housing types.

There was discussion regarding how this would be a paradigm shift for the City and how they would implement these changes, such as where these housing products would be allowed in a neighborhood.

Senior Planner Darnell reviewed the changes to the residential site and design review standards. The Great Neighborhood Principles would be referenced in the standards. There was a focus on compatibility with existing neighborhoods and that these products would need to look like single family homes. The categories the housing types were grouped into were: tiny homes, cottage clusters, plexes, townhouses, single dwellings, and apartments. For each housing type there would be pages that provided an overview, definition, guiding principles, and photo examples as well as base development standards and scenarios for in fill development, new development with an alley, and new development without an alley. Each housing type would also have a basic site plan including parking area and setbacks. The design standards would be described as universal design standards and each housing type would be subject to most of them. This would allow for features and characteristics in all of the housing types that were similar to a single family home. There would still be flexibility and options in housing design, but this would address some of the key components that were important to the community. He went through the categories of the design standards including street frontage, front yard, alleys, parking, garage, common and private open space, compatibility, and façade. This was an overview of what they would be working on for the next few months and an updated draft would be brought back to the Commission in April or May.

There was discussion regarding what the design standards would include, how they would be incentivized while still having objective standards, making it digestible and with more pictures, and getting input from the builders in the community.

Planning Director Richards gave an update on the Baker Creek North project. The City Council held a public hearing on the application. There was some support for the project, as well as opposition, and the applicant opposed some of the conditions. These conditions were the size of the driveway when it reached the public right-of-way and the design standards for the residential development. The opposition focused on transportation impacts, density, and commercial development. The Council kept the record open for written comment for seven days after the public hearing, there was another seven days to rebut that testimony, and another seven days for final argument. That just closed on Tuesday. Staff would be creating the staff report for a March 10 City Council meeting where they would make a final decision. Council had asked staff to look at the residential design standards and the definition for grocery store in the commercial design standards.

There was discussion regarding the issues and concerns with this application.

B. Growth Planning Update

Planning Director Richards said the Council gave staff direction to begin work on expanding the Urban Growth Boundary and analyzing an Urban Reserve Area. They had applied for a grant from DLCD and DLCD had concerns due to comments made by Thousand Friends. DLCD agreed to give the City \$25,000 to pursue another path. Staff was asked to bring back all of the options and the Council direction was to pick up the 2003 Urban Growth Boundary expansion submittal that was appealed with three assignments, two that were affirmed and one that was remanded back to the City to respond to and the City had elected to delay their response at the time. The Council also wanted staff to explore a legislative fix just for McMinnville. There were times when a legislative fix had happened for other cities, but it was controversial. In looking over the 2003 submittal, there were a lot of similar things to what they were currently talking about in terms of planning, such as neighborhood activity centers and population growth targets.

Staff was also putting together a McMinnville Urban Area Management Committee to review private UGB expansion applications. The Planning Commission's representatives on the Committee were Robert Banagay and Gary Langenwalter.

3. Commissioner Comments

None

4. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards discussed upcoming agenda items.

There were comments from the audience about being in favor of moving forward with middle housing and a variety of housing types for various income levels.

5. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 6:48 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary