



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

April 19, 2018
Planning Commission
Work Session Meeting

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

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Vice-Chair Zack Geary, Commissioners: Erin Butler, Martin Chroust-Masin Susan Dirks, Gary Langenwalter, Roger Lizut, and Erica Thomas

Members Absent: Lori Schanche

Staff Present: Heather Richards – Planning Director

1. Call to Order

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

Commissioner Langenwalter shared slides of a Massachusetts minutemen reenactment group of which he had been a part. This was in recognition of Paul Revere's ride on April 18.

2. Citizen Comments

Mayor Hill thanked the Planning Commission for their work. He then gave an update on the strategic planning process.

3. Approval of Minutes

- **March 15, 2018**

Commissioner Langenwalter moved to approve the March 15, 2018 minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lizut and passed 8-0.

4. Presentations:

- **Planning for Growth**

Planning Director Richards gave a presentation on planning for growth. She discussed how there was anxiety in the community about growth. She had people come into the Planning office every week looking for opportunities to develop in the City, however currently there were more constraints than opportunities available. There were also discussions regarding annexing land to develop, but there was not a lot of land available either. Since this was the case, she had been asked if the Urban Growth Boundary could be expanded, and she explained how that was a difficult process due to the data analysis that was required. Many people asked her as the

Planning Director where she thought McMinnville should grow, but that was a community dialogue and decision. Planning for growth was vital to the success of the community and had to be thought through carefully. It set the stage for the community's future and protected and preserved what was loved for the next generation. It was governed by state law through Statewide Planning Goal 14. The Urban Growth Boundary was supposed to serve the community for the next 20 years of population growth. It was governed by Oregon Administrative Rules which detailed the Urban Growth Boundary process. The City tried to amend the UGB starting in 1993 without much success and the data and process had been appealed through the court system.

Planning Director Richards described the City's current conditions. The UGB was about 7,500 acres which included 4% of the County's Exclusive Farm Use land. The population had grown by over 226% and the UGB had grown by 7% since the 1980s. The soils map had been revised and showed that high value farmland surrounded McMinnville. Most of the west side of the City was low density residential due to a sewer capacity issue. That issue had been resolved and a lot of planned developments had gone in with higher densities. Even though there were collections of high density product, there were large lot subdivisions as well and the efficiency they were gaining from high density was being off-set by the large lots. She then discussed the issues with constrained growth, such as eliminating an increase in the tax base to support the continued provision of City services, creating an increased disparity in housing affordability, creating an increased density and infill developments, changing the historic development pattern, higher living costs reduced the affordability of housing, forcing workers to live in outlying cities and commuting in which affected traffic, and higher land costs which forced higher density and reduced housing choices. Smart growth principles included an appropriate mix of land uses, a variety of housing types and sizes, pedestrian friendly, and created complete neighborhoods. They had to take into account who was living in the community and how they were living, the values of the community, planning for future generations, public health, needed infrastructure and how to fund it, costs for City services, tax reform, and quality of life. McMinnville would continue to grow and the new population projections showed that by 2035 there would be a little over 44,000 residents in McMinnville and currently there were 34,000. By 2067, there would be 64,000 people, nearly twice the size. She explained what the annual average growth rate had been in McMinnville and how it was intended for McMinnville to carry a third of the population in the County. From 2000 to 2010, the annual average growth rate for McMinnville was 1.9% and for the unincorporated areas it was 0.4%, however from 2010 to 2015 the average growth rate for McMinnville was 0.5% and for the unincorporated areas it was 1.9%. She discussed the permitting levels for single family and multi-family dwelling units over the last 27 years and how they were trending at the same rate they were in the 90s. Commercial permitting was down and not recovering and industrial permitting was the same. She compared these to the City of Redmond which had gone back up when McMinnville's hadn't. She then discussed the trends for population age groups and how the majority moving in to the City were families trying to establish themselves. She explained the future forecasting for the population growth rate, which was going down due to the baby boomer generation dying, and the migration rate which remained the same. People were aging, and they had to think about serving that population and aging in place. There would need to be dialogue in how to accommodate the projected population growth, whether it be up or out or a hybrid of both.

There was discussion regarding why McMinnville was not recovering as much as other cities and the right scale of density to bring into the City.

Planning Director Richards discussed population forecasts for more perspective. There would need to be a 10% land addition to the City by 2035, but the amount of farmland they would need to take from the county was 0.4%. For the 50 year growth pattern, there would need to be a 30%

land addition and 1% from the county. This would require long range planning to protect quality of life including public facility planning and buildable lands analysis. She explained the new simplified UGB expansion process and the problems that had been found with it and compared it to the standard process. She also explained how the City was currently working on the buildable lands inventory and housing needs analysis. She recommended initiating the community discussions on growth as soon as possible, and she had put funds in the budget for the process. This would be to decide if the City wanted to pursue a UGB expansion through the standard process. She also recommended looking at and establishing urban reserve areas. The UGB expansion would take a minimum of five years to complete. She then described the analysis that was required for these processes. The two things McMinnville residents disliked the most were density and sprawl, and these had to be taken into account through the discussions. She confirmed they could grow into the high value farmland, but the question was how much and how to use the land that was brought in efficiently and responsibly.

There was discussion regarding farming vertically, increased cost of City services, revenue sources, and next steps.

- **Annexations**

Planning Director Richards provided information on the annexation process. In 1996 a measure went to the citizens to allow voter approved annexation and it was passed. It was included in the Charter and the process for annexation was adopted by ordinance. She explained the requirements for annexation per the ordinance and the procedure for annexation requests. Two years ago the legislature passed a law that took away voter approved annexations if the annexation requests met certain criteria. She explained the processes annexation applications could use now, a land use process only or a pre-annexation agreement which was a negotiation between the City and property owner, and then a land use process. For pre-annexation agreements, some cities required dedication of rights-of-way and easements and some required the property owners to master plan the areas and the property owner agreed not to remonstrate against the formation of a future Local Improvement District or reimbursement district. She explained the benefits of pre-annexation agreements and the land use process to annex the properties. This issue was taken to the City Council because currently the rules of the City said annexations went to a vote of the citizens and rather than just deleting the language, staff was recommending changing it to the pre-annexation agreement. The Council agreed to move forward as recommended.

There was discussion regarding how the pre-annexation process would work.

Mark Davis provided some public testimony that he was optimistic that the UGB expansion process would be successful this time. He thought voter approved annexations happened because so much growth was going on and the public felt like they were being shut out of the process. He thought voter approved annexations were successful, and only one application was voted down in McMinnville, which was a huge annexation that was controversial. He was not against the pre-annexation agreement, but would like public involvement included early in the process.

5. Commissioners Comments

None

6. Staff Comments

Planning Director Richards gave an update on the Senior Planner and Associate Planner recruitment. Commissioner Dirks volunteered to serve on the interview committee.

Planning Director Richards stated there were volunteer opportunities for the Buildable Lands Inventory/Housing Needs Analysis/Housing Strategy Committee, Three Mile Lane Project Committee, and the Great Neighborhoods Committee.

7. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary