



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

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

**April 1, 2021**  
**Planning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**

**6:30 pm**  
**Zoom Online Meeting**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Roger Hall, Robert Banagay, Sylla McClellan, Brian Randall, Lori Schanche, Beth Rankin, Dan Tucholsky, and Sidonie Winfield

**Members Absent:** Gary Landenwaller and Ethan Downs – Youth Liaison

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director, Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner, and Tom Schauer – Senior Planner

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

- **November 19, 2020**
- **February 18, 2021**

Commissioner McClellan moved to approve the November 19, 2020 and February 18, 2021 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rankin and passed 8-0.

## 3. Citizen Comments

None

## 4. Work Session:

- **HB 2001 Rule Making / McMinnville Residential Site and Design Review Standard Package**

Senior Planner Darnell gave a presentation on HB 2001 and residential code update. The Planning Department worked with a consultant on draft development and design standards for housing types. The standards were reviewed by the Commission in 2020. The document included tiny houses, cottage clusters, plexes, townhouses, single dwellings, ADUs, and apartments. The structure of the document was that each housing type had a basic development standards table to address lot dimensions, lot sizes, setbacks, building height, and parking as well as standards for three scenarios: with/without alley and infill. Each housing type would be subject to the applicable universal design standards. The universal design standards addressed street frontage, front yard, alleys, parking, common open space, private open space, compatibility, façade, and subdivisions. HB 2001 required cities of certain sizes to allow middle housing in areas and properties that

allowed for the development of detached single family dwellings. The focus was on housing choice or housing options. DLCD adopted a model code in December 2020. If a city did not implement their own code/plan amendments prior to the deadline of June 2022, the model code applied directly. He discussed the current scope of work for updates to the draft and zoning districts. He asked if the Planning Commission was interested in pursuing the percentage-of-lots approach. Staff thought that type of program would be difficult to manage over time. A more consistent application of middle housing types throughout the entire city would better align with the Great Neighborhood Principles intent.

There was consensus to allow middle housing types across the board in all residential zones.

Senior Planner Darnell asked if the Commission was interested in pursuing a new residential zone where middle housing types would be allowed with more flexibility in the development standards. Staff recommended considering a flexible residential zone, but also right-size development standards for McMinnville.

There was discussion regarding possible development standards that could be added.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed infill vs. new development and lots greater than 10,000 and 14,000 square feet in the City. He asked if the Commission was supportive of establishing thresholds for infill vs. new development based on lot size. Staff recommended establishing a threshold at 14,000 square feet and all infill development should match the base zoning on the interior and perimeter.

There was discussion regarding looking at adjacent sites to new development and whether they were incompatible or had a negative impact to existing neighborhoods, what the threshold size should be, current minimum lot sizes, options for the flex zone, and Planned Development criteria.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed design standards. He asked if the Commission was interested in applying design standards to middle housing types. Staff recommended applying the universal design standards to all housing types.

There was support for staff's recommendation.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the off-street parking standards. He asked if the Commission was interested in considering any on-street parking allowances. Did the parking requirements based on lot size have any impact on the Commission's consideration of the potential smaller lot sizes in the new development standards? Staff recommended considering new development standards, but right-size them for McMinnville's off-street parking needs.

There was discussion regarding off street parking based on lot size or unit, stacking in the driveway, concern about on street parking and not enough space for fire and garbage trucks, concern about equity, visitor parking, how they could not mandate more than one parking space per unit with HB 2001, Planned Unit Development parking standards, lack of parking affecting quality of life, lack of transit in McMinnville, use of parking lots at night, adding a lot coverage standard for green space on lots, and whether the HB 2001 rules applied to Planned Developments for parking standards.

There was consensus to not consider any on-street parking allowances and concern about potential small lot sizes for missing middle development that would allow only one or two off-street parking spaces, such as only two parking spaces for a quadplex.

Senior Planner Darnell then discussed lot sizes for middle housing types, lot sizes in current zones, options for lot sizes, and existing lots under 5,000 square feet, 5,000 to 6,999 square feet, and lots larger than 7,000 square feet. He asked what approach the Commission would like to follow: strict compliance with the OARs by following existing zoning district minimum lot sizes for all middle housing types (besides townhouses), allowing middle housing types (besides townhouses) on lots smaller than 5,000 or 7,000 square feet, or limiting quadplexes and cottage clusters in the R-3 and R-4 zones to lots of at least 7,000 square feet.

There Commission was comfortable allowing middle housing types on lots smaller than 5,000 or 7,000 square feet only if they were following the Planned Development process. There was support for larger lots to accommodate more parking, getting visuals of potential scenarios that could be created on these lots, and driving by current examples in the City.

Senior Planner Darnell explained the number of units per lot per the OARs. He asked if the Commission was interested in allowing more units per parcel (either through extra dwellings or ADUs) than was strictly required by the OARs. Staff recommended not allowing additional units.

There was consensus to not allow additional units.

Senior Planner Darnell asked if the Commission was interested in allowing middle housing types (besides townhouses) to be detached in any configuration. Staff recommended allowing detached units in any configuration as long as the base development and design standards were achieved.

There was support for staff's recommendation, but concern about developers using that to create cottage clusters that did not follow the cottage cluster standards.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed the development standards by housing type. He asked if the Commission was interested in keeping the universal design standards format. Staff recommended updating individual universal design standards to be more specific and meet OAR requirements.

There was support for staff's recommendation.

Senior Planner Darnell discussed other considerations for the O-R (Office-Residential) zone and NE Gateway Planned Development Overlay. He asked if the Commission was interested in having the standards for these housing types the same in the O-R zone. Staff recommended using consistent standards in the O-R zone. Some updates would be necessary to permitted uses in the NE Gateway ordinance to be consistent with HB 2001.

There was discussion regarding the current uses in the O-R zone and NE Gateway District and how universal design standards worked with conversions.

Senior Planner Darnell said there would be public forums in April on these topics. The consultant would use the Planning Commission and public feedback to make amendments to the draft code in a hearing ready format to be completed by the end of May 2021. At the June 2021 Planning Commission meeting, staff would provide an update on the code amendment work. Final adoption needed to occur by June 30, 2022.

- **SRO Review**

Senior Planner Schauer discussed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to allow and regulate Single Room Occupancy (SRO) development as a housing type in McMinnville. The intent was that this housing type would be part of the bundle of code amendments related to middle housing development and residential development and design

standards, although this housing type was not required by HB 2001. The draft code language was recommended by the Affordable Housing Committee. Single Room Occupancy housing developments were not currently permitted. SRO housing developments allowed for one or more common facilities to be shared by some or all units, rather than every unit having all of those facilities. Many ordinances, including McMinnville's, defined dwelling units in a way that limited the number of unrelated people that may occupy a dwelling, typically no more five unrelated persons. SROs could offer greater affordability by reducing the amount of area within a building that was otherwise devoted to separate individual kitchen and/or sanitation facilities, as well as the associated construction, plumbing, and dedicated electrical costs. It also allowed for a social housing model that was desired by some people and the size of an SRO development and number and ratio of common/shared facilities could be scaled to meet different needs that allowed occupancy by a greater number of unrelated persons. He explained the key provisions for small and large SRO housing developments and the applicable zones where they would be allowed as well as the proposed standards. He then showed examples of these types of units.

There was discussion regarding the difference between subleasing rooms in a house or apartment and SROs, differentiating between VRBOs and SROs, and where SROs would be located.

## **5. Commissioner Comments**

None

## **6. Staff Comments**

Planning Director Richards explained the City was going into a furlough program and how that would affect the Planning Department's work.

## **7. Adjournment**

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 9:52 p.m.