

MINUTES

February 19, 2026
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm
Hybrid Meeting
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Sidonie Winfield, Brian Everest, Sylla McClellan (zoom), Brian Randall, Matt Jones (zoom), Abigail Neilan, Rachel Flores (zoom), and Elena Mudrak (zoom)

Members Absent: Meg Murray

Staff Present: Tom Schauer – Senior Planner, Heather Richards – Community Development Director, Matthew Deppe – Associate Planner, Taylor Graybehl – Senior Planner, Evan Hietpas (zoom) – Acting Planning Manager and Associate Housing Planner, and Missy Ryan (zoom) – Legal Counsel

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

Manuel Castaneda, McMinnville resident, had come to speak about natural resource preservation of trees. He loved trees but cautioned the Commission not to make the restrictions too strict. He was a contractor and had a client in Portland with trees that needed to be removed, and the permit to remove them was extremely expensive.

3. Public Hearings

A. Legislative Hearing: Natural Hazards Planning (G 3-22)

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.

Bruce Billit, McMinnville resident, was concerned about the change to his property and asked what the basis for the change was.

City Attorney Ryan thought his question would be answered by the staff report.

Staff Presentation: Community Development Director Richards presented the Natural Hazards Planning Program. This program identified hazards in McMinnville and how to

protect people and property from these natural hazards becoming natural disasters with mitigation planning. She discussed City Goal 7, Natural Hazards Work, what natural hazards planning was, Oregon Land Use Goal 7 which required cities to conduct natural hazard planning, what natural hazards were, history of hazard planning in McMinnville, City of McMinnville zoning, why this work was being done now, Yamhill County update in 2018/19, Oregon Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan update in 2020, adding a social vulnerability assessment, Yamhill County probability scores for floods, earthquakes, and landslides, factors that influenced an area's susceptibility to landslides, hazard mapping as part of the UGB work in 2020, soil liquefaction, City Council policy direction, mitigation planning, natural hazards inventory and risk assessment update in 2021, implications to the UGB, new natural hazards overlay zones, conformance/exemptions, Natural Hazards Mitigation Zone requirements for new construction, Natural Hazards Protection Zone requirements for new construction, transfer of development rights, partner agency outreach, public outreach, property owner comments and concerns, Planning Commission additions to the program, DLCD and DOGAMI staff suggestions, scoring methodology, old and new overlay maps, floodplain zone and FEMA compliance, legal tests, how the proposed amendments put the City in compliance, and new testimony received prior to this public hearing.

Proponents: None

Opponents: Mike Full, McMinnville resident, was concerned about the cumulative effect of the program. He spoke about a high-density development going in next to him, and how he had opposed it due to the danger of erosion on the surrounding properties. High density housing should not be put on the riverbank, especially when it was susceptible to landslides, flooding, and earthquakes. He was concerned about what it would be in the future if high density continued to be developed on the riverbanks.

Community Development Director Richards said they had not looked at the cumulative effect of development on surrounding properties. She would reach out to DOGAMI and the state to see what they would recommend.

Eric Abrams, McMinnville resident, said his lot was in the mitigation zone. When he purchased his house, he was told he needed flood insurance because the floodplain touched his property. He had to contest it and get a flood certification that it would not affect his house. By getting rezoned into the mitigation zone, he was concerned that it would reduce the value of his property.

Mark Davis, McMinnville resident, objected due to the work being based on information that was not accurate. The data used to classify properties should be corrected before the program was adopted. He thought it was the responsibility of the state to fix the data, and he explained the areas of the mitigation zone that were incorrectly placed in the floodplain on the map.

Community Development Director Richards explained the floodplain was removed from the hazard risk scores and development would not be allowed to occur there.

City Attorney Ryan said the state expected the City's decision to be supported by an adequate factual base. It did not have to be perfect and the issues with the mapping were not uncommon for these types of large-scale maps.

Lonnie Watne, McMinnville resident, asked if any of the data took fill into consideration. He had seen a number of houses being built on 30-40 feet of fill on a hillside that was subject to landslides. His own house was built on fill and had cracks in the foundation and ceiling.

Community Development Director said due to the landslide risk in the West Hills, the building official put a condition of approval that all new construction would need a geo-assessment report and engineered fill would be used to support the foundation. The mitigation they were talking about was what was occurring out in the West Hills area after 2017.

Mr. Watne did not think it was sufficient for the slope.

Randy Johnson, McMinnville resident, discussed the impact to existing homes. The maps did not show whether the mitigation had been addressed or resolved, and insurance rates could be increased for those in these zones. He was also concerned about reduced property values. For the appeal process, all the proof and cost for mitigation was on the property owner and it did not include appealing for existing homes. He thought a statistician should look at the ranking system as he was concerned about the risk probability.

Christine Garrison, McMinnville resident, asked for more information about where the zones were located. She wanted to know if the changes would affect her property, especially if she was not building anything. Community Development Director Richards would send her a map. There would be no effect if she wasn't going to build anything on the property.

Commission Discussion: Commissioner Jones suggested changing the name for insurance, instead of "hazards" for the overlay titles it could be "building restrictions." Community Development Director Richards said staff could come back with a name change.

Commissioner Randall said the fire mitigation description had a 40-foot clearance around properties, what would happen if there was a significant tree in that area. Associate Housing Planner Hietpas said It would be a criterion for removal or they could limb up the tree.

Commissioner Everest asked if the geo-technical reports required looking at the impact to neighboring properties. Community Development Director Richards did not know, but they could recommend to the City Council an amendment to add language relative to that.

Commissioner Mudrak asked if fill was outside of this discussion because it was not a natural hazard. Community Development Director Richards said the geotech report said engineered fill was supposed to be used for the mitigation and it was inspected on site.

Commissioner McClellan MOVED to CONTINUE the hearing for Natural Hazards Planning (G 3-22) to a date to be published in the future. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mudrak and passed unanimously 8-0.

B. Quasi-Judicial Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Map amendment (CPA 1-25) and Zone Change (ZC 2-25), 2325 NE Three Mile Lane, 160 NE Atlantic St., 2205, 2215, 2225, 2245, and 2305 NE Cumulus Ave., and property with no address (Tax Lot R4422CC 1102), Tax Lots R4422CC 100, 400, 500, 600, 601, 700, 800, 1100, 1102

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 Commissioner had visited the site. Most of the Commission had.

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 Presentation: Associate Housing Planner Hietpas presented the request for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and zone change for eight parcels of approximately 26.07 acres. The Comprehensive Plan amendment was to change the designation from industrial, residential, commercial, and floodplain to residential, commercial, and floodplain and the zone change from M-2, C-3, R-4, R-1, and F-P to C-3, R-4, and F-P. He described the project, Comprehensive Plan proposal, zone change proposal, staff recommendation for approval, project area, Three Mile Lane Area Plan, review procedures, review criteria, findings showing how the applications met the criteria, and conditions of approval.

There was discussion regarding the future trail system which was not part of this application and grandfathering in the industrial use and replacement requirements.

Applicant's Testimony: Ken Sandblast, representing the applicant, explained the industrial use already on the property would continue for some time. The proposal was consistent with the new Three Mile Lane Area Plan, and this was a catalyst property embracing the plan. It was the first step in a long process. The commercial zone was already on the property but was reconfigured to match the Three Mile Line Plan and the floodplain would be untouched. They recognized the plan for the future trail system and that would be addressed in the development proposal in the future. They held two neighborhood meetings and had a good turnout. This would help provide housing and commercial land needed by the City.

Proponents: None

Opponents: Kathleen McKinney, McMinnville resident, said this would have a huge, negative impact on the neighborhood. Some of the concerns were single lane streets, increased traffic, noise, blind corners, school bus stop and children playing in the streets, and decreased privacy, security, and safety.

Dan Jones, McMinnville resident, opposed the zone change to 160 NE Atlantic. He thought the property should remain R-1 and not be combined with the other areas due to public safety issues. This was on an old, narrow street and failed to handle the current traffic. Kids and animals played in the street and cars parked on the street making it difficult to navigate. The road had been designed to be a cul-de-sac and not a thru road with spot zoning. If the zone change was approved, one house would have to be demolished and eviction of a long-time family living there. The proposal was for 17 two story row homes instead of 8 R-1 single family homes. He thought it should remain R-1 and not be part of the future development.

Mike Full, McMinnville resident, said he had talked to the developer who was building near his property and the developer said it would match the neighborhood with a mixture of single family, duplexes, and townhouses. However, they developed 20 common wall townhouses.

He did not want to see yet another project that did not follow the original design. He wanted to keep the neighborhood as it was. He did not want high density development on the banks of the river. This was a critically fragile area and they had to have a plan for natural resources in order to reduce risks to people and property. However, the housing policies gave emphasis to not exclude needed housing, unnecessarily decreased densities, or allow conditions that would discourage needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.

Community Development Director Richards said this was an application for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and zone change, not development.

Rebuttal: Mr. Sandblast said they had talked with Mr. Jones and the traffic on Atlantic was a known issue. The street was substandard and would need to be redeveloped in the future. The traffic study looked at that as part of the improvements that would be required when it was developed. Regarding the zoning, it would be consistent with the approved Three Mile Lane Plan for the properties and street system. No decisions had been made about demolishing homes. This was consistent with the code, plan, and policies and no development was being proposed at this time.

Commissioner Mudrak moved to close the public hearing and public record; Seconded by Commissioner Everest. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

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: Commissioner Jones understood the concerns of the neighbors, but the proposal was consistent with the Three Mile Lane Plan and the higher density across the street.

Commissioner Mudrak MOVED to RECOMMEND the City Council approve Dockets CPA 1-25 and ZC 2-25, the requested Comprehensive Plan Map amendment and zone change, subject to the conditions specified in the decision document; SECONDED by Commissioner Jones. The motion PASSED unanimously 8-0.

C. Quasi-Judicial Hearing: Conditional Use Permit (CU 2-25), 1430 NE Alpha Dr., Tax Lot R4415C 02600

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 Commissioner had visited the site. Most of the Commission had.

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 Presentation: Associate Planner Deppe presented the request for a Conditional Use application for a portion of an existing structure on Alpha Drive to be a private gym. He gave

a project description, site plan, staff recommendation for approval, site zoning, existing conditions, review procedures, testimony received, and findings.

The applicant was present for questions.

Commissioner Everest asked when the gym would be open. The applicant answered with times of the classes, noting it would close at 8 p.m.

Commissioner McClellan asked if they were already operating in the space. The applicant confirmed they were.

Proponents: Christopher Burton, McMinnville resident, asked for approval. This was the applicant's dream and brought a lot of value to the community.

Opponents: None

Commissioner Mudrak moved to close the public hearing and public record; Seconded by Commissioner Jones. The motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Chair Winfield closed the public hearing.

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

Commissioner Mudrak MOVED to APPROVE Conditional Use Permit (CU 2-25), 1430 NE Alpha Dr, subject to the conditions specified in the decision document; SECONDED by Commissioner Jones. The motion PASSED unanimously 8-0.

4. Action Items: Deliberation and decision for the following application:

A. Land Use Extension Request, Tentative Partition Plan (MP 3-22), Tax Lot R4524 00904

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.

Community Development Director Richards said the applicant had requested an additional extension to their project as they were negotiating an easement with the neighboring property owner to install a power vault. McMinnville Water & Light had indicated that this was near resolution but would not be complete by the deadline of March 2. She recommended an extension to March 2, 2027.

Commissioner Mudrak MOVED to APPROVE the land use extension request for Tentative Partition Plan (MP 3-22) to March 2, 2027; SECONDED by Commissioner Everest. The motion PASSED unanimously 8-0.

5. Commissioner Comments

None

6. Staff Comments

Community Development Director Richards stated MPWR had appealed the decision for the sign exception denial, and it would go to City Council in March.

Senior Planner Schauer discussed the items on the March 5 meeting agenda.

7. Adjournment

Chair Winfield adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m.