



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

www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov

MINUTES

July 19, 2018
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting

6:30 pm
McMinnville Civic Hall, 200 NE 2nd Street
McMinnville, Oregon

Members Present: Chair Roger Hall, Commissioners: Martin Chroust-Masin, Gary Langenwalter, Lori Schanche, and Erica Thomas

Members Absent: Erin Butler, Susan Dirks, Zack Geary, and Roger Lizut

Staff Present: Chuck Darnell – Senior Planner

1. Call to Order

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

2. Citizen Comments

None

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Public Hearing

A. Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment & Zone Change (CPA 1-18 & ZC 1-18) (Exhibit 1)

Request: Approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan Map designation of a property from Industrial to Residential, and to rezone the property from M-1 (Light Industrial) to R-4 (Multiple-Family Residential) to allow for development of residential uses that are permitted in the R-4 (Multiple-Family Residential) zone.

Location: The subject site is zoned M-1 (Light Industrial) and is located at 1601 NE McDaniel Lane and is more specifically described as Tax Lot 7100, Section 16DB, T.4 S., R.4 W., W.M.

Applicant: Daniel Danicic

Chair Hall opened the public hearing and read the hearing statement. He asked if there was any objection to the Commission's jurisdiction to hear this matter. There was none. He asked

if anyone on the Commission had disclosures to make or would abstain from participating or voting on this application. There was none.

Senior Planner Darnell presented the staff report. This was a request for a zone change and Comprehensive Plan Map amendment at 1601 NE McDaniel Lane. The amendment was to change from industrial to residential, and if that was approved to rezone the property from M-1, light industrial, to R-4, multiple family residential. The applicant provided a concept plan for the site that showed the future intention of the use of the property, but that plan was treated as a concept plan and would not be binding on the site in any way. He reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Map amendment criteria and how the request met the goals and policies for developing affordable and quality housing for residents and providing a variety of different housing types and densities. Previous analysis was completed in the 2001 McMinnville Buildable Land Needs Analysis and Growth Management Plan and the 2013 Economic Opportunities Analysis that compared residential and industrial land in the City. Those analyses showed a surplus of industrial land and a need for additional residential land. The area around the site had various land use designations. There were areas where residential abutted industrial. This request was not inconsistent with the surrounding area and development pattern.

Regarding the zone change criteria, Senior Planner Darnell explained there was a need for additional R-4 land, based on the needs identified in the 2001 McMinnville Buildable Land Needs Analysis and Growth Management Plan. The property was currently not committed to low density residential and as an industrial site, it was planned to have more intense development. It was not subject to any development limitations as the site was flat and had services available and there was no concern regarding capacity to serve the site as R-4. The site was in a quarter mile of transit service and commercial shopping locations. The items the property lacked were: buffering of the low density residential to the west, access to a major collector or arterial, and it was not adjacent to a public or private open space. The applicant provided a traffic impact analysis which showed there were no issues identified with the R-4 use and the surrounding streets could accommodate the additional traffic. Some of the uses in the existing industrial zoning could have created more traffic than what was being proposed. With staff's conditions of approval, the application could meet the criteria for buffering of the adjacent low density residential by providing a landscape buffer and fence on the west property line as well as through rear yard setbacks and lower building height. Regarding buffering from the railroad corridor, staff suggested a landscape buffer and fence on the south side of the site. These buffers would be reviewed by the Landscape Review Committee. Regarding the open space, staff suggested providing an area dedicated to usable open space on the site for residents, which was about 4,300 square feet. There was another R-4 site to the north of this property which showed the application was consistent with the zoning of the surrounding area, and there were other residential uses around the industrial and railroad corridor. Adequate utilities and services could be provided to the site.

Senior Planner Darnell stated that the traffic analysis showed there would be minor impacts to surrounding intersections, but it would not change the level of service of those intersections. The site access would be on McDaniel Lane which was found adequate to serve the site. The analysis was based on development of 24 units on the property as proposed in the concept plan; however the maximum number of units allowed was 29. Staff suggested another condition that required a trip cap on the site for any future proposed development and that the cap be the maximum number of average daily trips that were analyzed in the traffic study, which was 176 daily trips. If the applicant wanted to increase the number of units, they would have to do a new traffic impact analysis.

Senior Planner Darnell stated that since the time of the packet completion, one additional item of public testimony had been received. It was from a resident to the northwest who was concerned about the potential height of the apartments, loss of privacy, and increased traffic and noise. Staff thought the conditions of approval would address some of these concerns. Staff recommended approval of the application with conditions, however he requested the hearing be continued to August 16 to allow for notice to be placed in the newspaper.

Commissioner Langenwaller asked if the proposed buffer for the neighboring residential property would be sufficient. Senior Planner Darnell said that the ten foot landscape buffer was what staff was suggesting and he thought it should be sufficient.

Applicant: Daniel Danicic, representing the property owner, and Charles Parr II, property owner, asked for a modification to the conditions. They were concerned that if the ten foot buffer was increased, they would have difficulty placing the units on the property. For Condition #3 regarding the 20 foot landscape buffer to the south, they asked that the trash enclosure and a minor intrusion of the parking lot be allowed in that buffer area. For Condition #5 regarding the open space, there was a park nearby that was just over a quarter of a mile away. They did not think the quarter mile from a park was a hard and fast criterion in the code, but was more of a rule of thumb for what was reasonable. There was not a 4,000 square foot space available on the property for the open space and they asked that the Commission to delete Condition #5. In the neighborhood meeting there was concern about privacy and they had attempted to change the alignment of the buildings. However, the setback requirements would not be met with that realignment. What was proposed was the most effective and efficient use to follow the setbacks and parking requirements in the code.

Commissioner Schanche suggested a connection to the sidewalks that was not through the parking lot. She also had concerns regarding the buffering.

Commissioner Langenwaller asked how many stories this development would be. Mr. Parr said it would be three stories, which would be around 32 feet in height.

Commissioner Langenwaller asked if there were any other apartments of that height in the vicinity. Mr. Parr said there were none in the neighborhood, but there were some in the surrounding area.

Commissioner Langenwaller said in trying to keep with the character of the neighborhood, was there was a way to build the 24 units in two stories with the footprint they had and still have decent sized apartments. Mr. Parr replied no, not with the setbacks, buffers, and parking required.

Proponent: None

Opponent: Mike Mathen, McMinnville resident, lived directly west of this property. He thought the size of the buildings would negatively impact the neighborhood. He asked that the Planning Commission include any conditions possible to address the taller building height that could be developed.

Neutral: Jason Petredis, McMinnville resident, asked since this was adjacent to a rail line, was there a study on the frequency of the rail traffic and safety risks, especially for children that might live in these units. He also asked if there were other residential properties adjacent to the railroad.

Senior Planner Darnell said the traffic study included the railroad crossing in regard to delays to traffic. Pedestrian connectivity and safety was not included in that study. There were other high density residential areas located near the railroad. There were conditions of approval, such as the buffering, that could mitigate the safety concerns, and that the applicant could also address safety concerns in their site design.

Mr. Petredis thought the nearby park had less than desirable activities going on in it and was not a park families would want to use. Chair Hall said unfortunately that was not a criterion, only the distance to a park was.

There was consensus to continue the public hearing to August 16, 2018.

5. Discussion Items

- Long Range Planning Project Updates

Senior Planner Darnell gave an update on the buildable lands inventory and housing needs analysis and housing strategy. The consultants had begun the work on these projects, and they would be a year-long process. The Great Neighborhood Principles process would begin soon as well. Two new Planning staff members had been hired, and would be introduced at the August Planning Commission meeting.

6. Old/New Business

None

7. Commissioner/Committee Member Comments

None

8. Staff Comments

None

9. Adjournment

Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.



Heather Richards
Secretary