

# MINUTES

**February 6, 2025**  
**Planning Commission**  
**Regular Meeting**

**6:30 pm**  
**Hybrid Meeting**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Sidonie Winfield, Brian Everest, Beth Rankin, Rachel Flores, Matt Jones, Sylla McClellan, Brian Randall, and Elena Mudrak

**Members Absent:** Meg Murray

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Community Development Director, David Berniker – Planning Manager, Tom Schauer – Senior Planner, and Evan Hietpas, Associate Housing Planner

---

## 1. Call to Order

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

## 2. Citizen Comments

None

## 3. Minutes

- July 18, 2024

Commissioner Flores moved to approve the July 18, 2024, minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rankin and passed unanimously with Commissioner Everest abstaining.

- October 3, 2024

Commissioner Mudrak moved to approve the October 3, 2024, minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McClellan and passed unanimously with Commissioner Everest abstaining.

## 4. Public Hearings

- A. Quasi-Judicial Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPA 1-24) and Zone Change (ZC 4-24) for property at 2320 SE Stratus Avenue, Tax Lots R4427 600 and 604 )

**Continued from January 16, 2025**

**Request:** The applicant is requesting concurrent review and approval of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Industrial to Residential (CPA 1-24) and a Zone Change from M-1 to R-4 for property at 2320 SE Stratus Avenue, Tax Lots R4427 600 and 604, approximately 5.8 acres.

**Applicant:** Commonwealth Development Corporation c/o Daniel DeFrancesco on behalf of property owners Jodi Devonshire, Andrea Feero, and Jennifer Feero.

Chair Winfield opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. She asked if there was any objection to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear this matter. There was none. She asked if any Commissioner wished to make a disclosure or abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none. Chair Winfield asked if any Commissioners had visited the site. Many Commissioners had visited the site. Chair Winfield asked if any Commissioner needed to declare any contact prior to the hearing with the applicant or any party involved in the hearing or any other source of information outside of staff regarding the subject of this hearing. There was none.

**Staff Report:** Associate Planner Hietpas presented the staff report. This was a continued public hearing for a request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from industrial to residential and zoning from M-1 to R-4 on two parcels on Stratus Avenue. He reviewed the subject property, Comprehensive Plan and zone change proposal, additional information entered into the record, review process and procedures, public hearing process, Planning Commission's role, review criteria, public testimony received, themes of the opposing testimony, and revised decision document.

Community Development Director Richards reminded the Commission that this was a Comprehensive Plan and zoning amendment, not a development proposal. One of the discussions at the previous hearing was about the fire code regulations, and these regulations were reviewed by the Fire Marshall. The Fire Marshall had reviewed the regulations for this application and did not find any issues with it. She addressed the key points of opposition and outlined the updated findings. For "needed" housing, she discussed the orderly and timely criterion and the caveat that when the proposed amendment concerned needed housing, this criterion would not apply. Testimony provided that they could not rely on the November 2023 Housing Needs Analysis and Economic Opportunity Analysis since they might be appealed to the Court of Appeals. So they would rely on the Housing Needs Analysis from 2001 and Economic Opportunity Analysis from 2014 that were approved. This analysis identified the need for more multi-family dwellings and that there would be a shift in the housing mix to a greater percentage of multi-family dwellings. The analysis also showed there was a surplus of 235.9 acres of industrial land and a deficit of several hundred acres of residential. Another criterion was that the proposed amendment be consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the housing policies of the Comprehensive Plan shall be given added emphasis and the other policies in the plan shall not be used to exclude needed housing, unnecessarily decrease densities, or allow special conditions which would have the effect of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay. She then explained the Three Mile Lane Area Plan which was adopted in 2022 and how the vision for the subject site was for medium to high density residential and that it was stated in the Comprehensive Plan that this was considered a future Plan Map amendment they wanted to see happen. The City had very limited supply of buildable land in the next five years for housing. There was a Comprehensive Plan policy for areas that would be good locations for medium and high

density residential. Stratus Avenue was a minor collector street. Public transit was less than a quarter mile away from the site and a future retail center, employment center, and neighborhood park were a half mile away. Regarding utilities and services being efficiently provided, the metrics were governed by state law, state administrative rules, and local regulations for transparency and equity. She explained the transportation analysis process which began with a trip generation memorandum. If the difference in average daily trips or pm peak hour trips warranted further analysis, the analysis would look at how the proposal impacted the system, both state and locally, based on modeling and adopted performance standards. The analysis would identify improvements needed to maintain performance standards on the system. In this case, they never went past the first step, however the applicant was willing to put a self-imposed trip cap, limiting the development to a maximum of 715 average daily trips. The City also required the proposal to do a trip generation memorandum prior to the building permit submittal and if the differential was 200 average daily trips and/or 20 pm peak hour trips, a traffic impact analysis would be required. Regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety, Stratus Avenue sidewalks existed or will exist for the expanse of Stratus within the City limits except for in front of the mobile home park. Regarding the access easement, it was a private document between property owners. The City regulated the number of lots that could use an access easement, which was three. The width needed to be a minimum of 15 feet and this was 25 feet, and the paved surface width needed to be a minimum of 10 feet and this was 25 feet. The property owner had agreed to move the access easement to the far eastern side of the property and would demolish the building that was in the way.

Associate Planner Hietpas then reviewed the conditions of approval. Staff recommended continuing the hearing to March 20 to allow the applicant to conduct a sanitary sewer capacity analysis.

Questions: There was discussion regarding how the trip cap was significantly less than what was considered a reasonable worst case scenario for the R-4 zone, for Condition #2 to specify the on-site vehicular circulation included semi-trucks and larger vehicles, and how they would probably not require street frontage improvements since the property was not on a street frontage but it was not part of this application.

Applicant's Testimony: Steve Kay, Cascadia Planning and Development Services, was representing the applicant. They agreed with staff's recommendation to continue the hearing. He confirmed that they planned to tear down the existing house and realign the easement. The business owners had been made aware of the realignment. The trip cap was based on about 100 units. They had not considered alternate easements as they intended to use the legal access to the property.

Proponents: Mike Morris, resident of McMinnville, was working with the Feero family. He had conversations with the property owner to the west and south and the property owner was willing to grant an easement, but the property was outside of the City limits and Urban Growth Boundary, and they could not create an easement to the property inside the City limits.

Opponents: Nicholas Helstrom, resident of McMinnville, lived on the property. The property owner had not approved the new alignment of the easement. He suggested amending the condition that they clearly delineate onsite vehicular circulation to Stratus Avenue, and he would like it pushed out to Stratus Village and a sidewalk put in across the mobile home park for better pedestrian safety. There needed to be a better school bus stop as well.

Malcom Greenlees, resident of McMinnville, thought they should reject the application based on the impact on family businesses, limited light commercial land available in the City, zoning criteria was excessively quantitative instead of qualitative, it was a terrible location for apartments, Stratus was a narrow road, and quality of life for the neighbors.

Randall Yates, resident of McMinnville, was concerned about the enforcement of the proposed trip cap and whether it took into account residents only or other people who might be using the road. Lack of access, congestion, and pedestrian safety were big concerns and he thought the proposal should be rejected.

Associate Planner Hietpas explained how the trip generation was determined and that it included deliveries and service worker trips.

Alex Botten, resident of McMinnville, noted there had been no agreement to change the access easement. City regulations allowed up to three parcels to utilize the shared access easement, but there were four parcels, NW Logging, Ed's Transmission, the existing building that would be demolished, and this new parcel. There were several multi-family housing developments proposed in this area, and all four would be rezoned from commercial/industrial into housing and would be within a thousand feet of each other. McMinnville needed businesses and good paying jobs, not apartment complexes that took up all the industrial and commercial land and residents shouldn't have to navigate through a private business complex to get to their homes. They should use up the 600 acres of residential land first.

There was discussion regarding the realignment of the access easement and how there was not an agreed upon solution at this time.

Community Development Director Richards said they did not show Ed's Transmission as having access off the easement.

William Barlow, resident of McMinnville, did not think the conditions were adequate to address all the concerns. He did not think it was consistent with the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the application should be denied.

John Rima, resident of McMinnville, talked about his grandson being hit by a passing truck while walking in this area. There needed to be sidewalks in this area. The easement issue was a hardship to the existing businesses.

Martin Vietz, resident of McMinnville, did not think proposing another apartment complex in this area when they did not know what it would be like with the ones that were currently being built was a good idea. There were already problems with traffic, intersections, McDonald's area, and bridge. He thought other locations would be better for more apartments.

Lana McKay Brown, resident of McMinnville, was concerned that the 300-foot notification standard, which was not enough for those neighbors that would be impacted. The traffic would be an issue, especially with the cumulative effect of the other apartments that were currently being built. She did not think this was the right location for another large complex.

There was discussion regarding the traffic study models and trip generation and how the planned improvements happened when the performance standards failed.

Mark Davis, resident of McMinnville, said this was not a good location to add more housing. There were 600 acres added to the Urban Growth Boundary for housing and there should be a place on that side of town that could accommodate this development. It was on the edge of a busy highway, it would be noisy, and there was no access to a City street but they were relying on a right-of-way. The application should be rejected because it did not meet the Great Neighborhood Principles. He thought the applicant should be the one explaining how they would meet the conditions, not staff.

Lynette Noble, resident of McMinnville, thought having two ways in and one way out of this development was wrong. Stratus was owned by ODOT and she questioned if they had the same requirements for traffic.

Community Development Director Richards clarified Stratus Avenue was in the City's jurisdiction and ODOT provided comments that they did not have any concerns at this stage in the process.

Roy Carter, resident of McMinnville, did not think this was a good fit due to the lack of infrastructure, access, and pedestrian safety.

Kory Knutz, resident of McMinnville, talked about the overburdening of an easement. He questioned if there would be room for sidewalks and travel lanes and the impacts to the businesses with the traffic and parking lots. This was a narrow corridor and it needed a secondary access.

Jason Bizon, resident of McMinnville, asked what happened if they exceeded the trip cap. He did not think this was orderly and timely and planning should be incremental. He agreed with the other opposing testimony.

Commissioner McClellan MOVED to CONTINUE the hearing for Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPA 1-24) and Zone Change (ZC 4-24) for property at 2320 SE Stratus Avenue, Tax Lots R4427 600 and 604) to March 20, 2025. SECONDED by Commissioner Jones. The motion PASSED 8-0.

Commissioner Randall encouraged the applicant to meet with the businesses and discuss the access issue to come to a solution.

## **5. Work Session**

- Long Range Planning 2025-2026 Work Plan

Community Development Director Richards reviewed the 2025-2026 work plan. She discussed staffing, long range planning work plan, developing staff work plans and project timeframes, status of the projects on the work plan, disrupters, and staffing capacity for the ambitious work program.

There was discussion regarding the work plan items, residential projects that had not happened yet, lowering the required parking for commercial and increasing the landscaping required, reviewing zoning for the downtown corridor and restricting the number of hotels and

AirB&Bs by applying the separation standards the Planning Commission had already worked on, and using Planning Commission subcommittees for the work.

There was consensus for staff to look into fitting the parking/landscaping requirements for commercial and separation standards for hotels and AirB&Bs into the work plan.

#### **6. Commissioner Comments**

There was discussion regarding joint work sessions with the City Council. Commissioner Flores noted she had a conflict on the second Tuesdays of the month.

Chair Winfield had volunteered with several other service groups to plant 39 trees in Joe Dancer Park.

#### **7. Staff Comments**

Community Development Director Richards discussed upcoming meetings.

#### **8. Adjournment**

Chair Winfield adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.