

MINUTES

March 20, 2025
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

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

Members Absent:

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

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. 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 and February 6, 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.

Commissioner Murray had contact with Andrea Feero, but they had not discussed the application.

Chair Winfield had been in the neighborhood and one of the neighbors brought up the petition, but Chair Winfield did not discuss it.

Staff Report: Associate Housing Planner Hietpas presented the staff report. This was a request for changing the Comprehensive Plan designation from industrial to residential and zoning from M-1 to R-4 for two parcels on Stratus Avenue. He reviewed the Comprehensive Plan and zone change proposal, Three Mile Lane Area Plan, additional information entered into the record, review process and procedures, public hearing process, Planning Commission action, updated decision document, public testimony received, themes of the opposing testimony, review criteria, definition of "needed housing," sanitary sewer capacity review and how utilities and services could be efficiently provided, transportation review steps, Condition #3: applicant's self-imposed "trip cap" to limit future development to a total of 715 daily trips, access easement legal review that determined the subject parcels were 2 of the 3 properties that had legal access from the recorded easement, and updated conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval with conditions and a revision to eliminate Criterion 17.74.020 (B) from the final findings of the Decision Document, as the exemption for "needed housing" had been met.

Questions: There was discussion regarding the sidewalks for the mobile home park.

Applicant's Testimony: Steve Kay, Cascadia Planning and Development Services, was representing the applicant. Many of the public comments had been addressed by staff and the conditions of approval, including the requirement to fully evaluate the public transportation system when a development proposal was submitted. The applicant understood and accepted that improvements to roadways and intersections in the study area might be required. The applicant had also proposed a trip cap of 715 average daily trips to assure the neighbors the site would not be developed to the maximum density. The proposal was consistent with the applicable Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and needed to be evaluated in the context of the Three Mile Lane Area Plan. The Area Plan was developed after an extensive outreach process and existing uses and the pattern of existing development in the area was analyzed. Economic development goals, required transportation improvements, and housing needs were all considered. The applicant was not involved in this process and did not advocate for the change from industrial to residential at that time. McMinnville community members had determined that the subject site should be designated as a multi-family use. The City held four public hearings before the plan was adopted. The applicant had reached out to NW Logging and Ed's Transmission to discuss the access if the zone change was approved. The revised concept plan proposed to relocate the existing access easement, provide a new location for the storage shed, retain the existing turnaround in the parking lot, and provide a privacy fence along the access drive and southern boundary of the parking area. He thought the applicable criteria had been met and the applicant would be responsive to the needs of the adjacent business owners.

Daniel DeFrancesco, Commonwealth Development Corporation, gave a background on the company and what they were trying to achieve. They were long-term owners of

developments and wanted to work with local organizations for affordable housing. They were following the City's plans for this site and did not plan to develop to the maximum density. They would put in a trip cap and planned to put in 96 units that were in two story buildings. They also met with the business owners to address their concerns. The residential building would be demolished for the easement realignment and they would work with the business owners on the storage shed.

Proponents: None

Opponents: Bill Ellis, resident of McMinnville, was concerned about the safety on Stratus Avenue as it was narrow and had blind corners and no sidewalks. He was also concerned about the impacts of the development on ground water and wildlife.

Alex Botten, resident of McMinnville, discussed staff's findings for needed housing. The need for residential land was not that much greater than the need for industrial/commercial land yet it kept getting rezoned to residential. He did not think apartment residents passing through an industrial area was compatible. This property was put in a generalized overlay plan without taking into consideration the logistics of access with high density housing. This site was the only lot on Stratus Avenue that was accessed by an easement. A 25 foot easement was not large enough for what they would be required to do. The decision should be based on what was on the deed, not what could hypothetically be. There was a lot of opposition from citizens to this application. If it was approved, he asked for an additional condition that the developer be required to install sidewalks in front of the mobile home park prior to the zone change. He thought the proposed realignment would work in a worst case scenario, but he planned to fight this to the end. He thought if the property remained industrial, it would be 100-200 daily trips for the property in the morning and evening, which would be reasonable rather than a 24-hour constant flow of traffic with residential. He bought the land expecting that the adjacent property would be light industrial. He would accept the 492 daily trips that might come from a light industrial development. He was most concerned about his landscaper customers trying to navigate the easement during operating hours.

Community Development Director Richards said staff would have to look into the proportionality for how much they could require of the developer regarding sidewalks for the mobile home park.

There was discussion regarding the proposed realignment, turnaround, fence, and sidewalk, and Condition #4 and what triggered the traffic analysis.

Nick Helstrom, resident of McMinnville, also suggested a condition to require a sidewalk in front of the mobile home park. There were 242 signatures of residents who were opposed to the development. Many wanted to wait until they knew the effects of the other developments in the area. There would be more people in the area with this development who might vandalize the businesses. He discussed his current lease in the building that would be torn down if the easement was realigned. It was a beautiful house and if it went through, he would have to move. However, he understood it was just a rental.

Lana Brown, resident of McMinnville, thought the application should be rejected because of the traffic impacts. She was still concerned about the cumulative effect of the additional developments. There was limited access and traffic congestion. It was the wrong place at the wrong time.

Martin Vietz, resident of McMinnville, asked questions about the project and surrounding developments, and how the request had to be approved if it met the criteria. He thought that law should be changed and that they should postpone approval until they saw the real effect of the other developments going in in this area. He thought the traffic would be a lot worse than what was predicted. He thought they needed to look at the exit and entrance to McDonald's which was a sight hazard.

Community Development Director Richards said that was a current hazard and could be submitted to Code Enforcement.

Mark Davis, resident of McMinnville, spoke about the Three Mile Lane Area Plan. This entire parcel was supposed to be zoned residential. However, someone bought two of the three parcels and put in businesses and now there was a conflict. The southern part of the parcel was designated as a park in the Three Mile Lane Area Plan and it should be dedicated as parkland to the City.

Shannon Botten, resident of McMinnville, noted all the housing proposed was low income, which was not a range of housing and put all one socio-economic group together.

Associate Housing Planner Hietpas said they had identified that all housing was "needed housing" across the spectrum and as long as the proposal was consistent with that, Criterion B was not part of the decision-making process. It was not required for the applicant to provide a variety of price ranges. It was saying City-wide they had needed housing that was expansive across a range of prices and housing types.

Ms. Botten did not think all the low income housing should be in one area. Commissioner Flores noted that the 138 units at Norton Landing was not income restricted. Staff defined affordable housing.

Malcolm Greenlees, resident of McMinnville, said good and valid issues were brought up at one meeting and deferred to the next meeting where numbers were given to support the solution. This was the wrong project at the wrong place at the wrong time. These projects would change the personality of this community as well as present substantial safety issues.

Rebuttal: Mr. Kay clarified this was not a Section 8 project. The residents would need to demonstrate income and if they had between 30% to 60% of the area income, they would qualify. Regarding the traffic study, it would be prepared by a transportation engineer who would look at all the approved developments in the pipeline for the cumulative effect. Regarding the sidewalk in front of the mobile home park, they could amend Condition #4 to add a requirement to fully evaluate the pedestrian safety along Stratus Avenue and determine whether a sidewalk should be required at the mobile home park.

Mr. DeFrancesco said they were waiting for funding from a state agency for constructing the apartments and they would have to submit an application to the City. Construction potentially could start by the end of the year or early next year.

There was discussion regarding water impacts on surrounding neighbors' ground water and how it was unlikely that there would be an impact to any property due to the regulations of the on-site stormwater retention design.

Commissioner McClellan MOVED to CLOSE the public hearing, SECONDED by Commissioner Jones. The motion PASSED 9-0.

Chair Winfield closed the public hearing.

The applicant waived the 7 day period for submitting final written arguments in support of the application.

Commission Deliberation: There was discussion regarding the conditions of approval, how the applicant was making their best attempt to come to an agreement to impact the businesses the least amount as possible, process for view obstructions, and need for housing.

There was consensus that the application was consistent with the Three Mile Lane Area Plan and met all the requirements. The applicant was willing to evaluate the pedestrian and traffic safety.

Commissioner Mudrak MOVED to RECOMMEND City Council APPROVAL of 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 with the conditions provided by staff and the adjustment to remove Criterion B from the Decision Document as well as adding the analysis of the sidewalk to Condition #4. SECONDED by Commissioner Jones. The motion PASSED 9-0.

Community Development Director Richards said staff would come back to the next meeting with a document for the Commission to adopt with language for the amendment to Condition #4.

B. Legislative Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Docket G 7-24) Water System Element of Public Facility Plan

Continued from January 16, 2025 and February 20, 2025

Request: **THE CITY OF MCMINNVILLE IS PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MCMINNVILLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS FOLLOWS:** (1) adopt portions of the 2011 Water Master Plan as amended by the 2024 Water Master Plan Addendum as part of the Public Facility Plan, a supporting document to the McMinnville Comprehensive Plan; (2) amend Volume I of the Comprehensive Plan to update data consistent with the updated Water System element of the Public Facility Plan; and (3) amend Volume II of the Comprehensive Plan to update policies consistent with the updated Water System element of the Public Facility Plan.

Applicant: City of McMinnville

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. Staff had requested the hearing be continued to May 1, 2025.

Commissioner McClellan MOVED to CONTINUE the hearing for Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Docket G7-24) Water System Element of Public Facility Plan to May 1, 2025. SECONDED by Commissioner Mudrak. The motion PASSED 9-0.

4. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Rankin discussed sales information for residential property transfers in 2024.

There was discussion regarding short term rentals in areas with CC&Rs getting approval from the HOA as part of the review process.

5. Staff Comments

Community Development Director Richards discussed changes to upcoming meetings.

6. Adjournment

Chair Winfield adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.