



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

MEMO

DATE: July 21, 2022
TO: Planning Commission Members
FROM: Tom Schauer, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Response to Questions – Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment CPA 1-22 & Zone Change ZC 2-22

STRATEGIC PRIORITY & GOAL:



GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

Guide growth & development strategically, responsively & responsibly to enhance our unique character.

OBJECTIVE/S: Strategically plan for short and long-term growth and development that will create enduring value for the community

Staff received questions from Planning Commissioners in advance of the July 21, 2022 public hearing for the above-referenced applications for the proposed map amendment at 455 NE Irvine St.

Below are staff's responses to the questions. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or if you would like any further clarification regarding the responses below.

1. Trip information (mentioned several times) is presented that there is expected to be LESS traffic to a commercial establishment (the implication is this will be another restaurant) than to the prior winery. I find that interesting, and realistically, hard to accept. It is not an issue with the streets but a question about the methodology to determine that volume. It's hard to believe that each weekday saw 128 vehicles accessing that property before, let alone a reduction of that amount would be expected. I pulled up some statistics about wine tasting traffic and saw this chart that includes an average for Oregon winery visits. ([Monthly wine tasting room visitors by region U.S. 2019 | Statista](#)). 1079 monthly visitors averages to 36 a day. A daily reduction of 128 vehicles, even with only 1 person in a car, would be way more than that. It just seems hokey even though it doesn't affect the issue before us. Reading the Memorandum prepared to present the traffic information did not ease my questions. The methodology may be what is used but bottom-line result does not make sense. Why not compare actual average daily visits in the past 4 years to the new proposed traffic? The winery would not know the number of cars that accessed their property, but they would know the number of people who bought wine. If that number is under 128 (or significantly higher we are to believe) then it shows a different methodology is needed.

STAFF RESPONSE: For a Comprehensive Plan Map/Zoning Map Amendment, the traffic analysis doesn't look at the prior existing use or a specific proposed use. Instead, it considers

“reasonable worst case scenario” of ALL of the possible uses permitted by the existing and proposed zoning. If the difference would exceed a specified threshold, the analysis must determine whether there would be a “significant effect” on transportation facilities by the end of the planning horizon based on a comparison of uses in the new zone compared to the existing zone.

For a specific use/development proposal, a traffic impact analysis may be required at the time of the use/development proposal to evaluate the specific impacts of the development on “opening day.” A TIA is generally required if a proposed use would result in a net increase in pm peak hour trips exceeding a certain threshold.

The current application before the Planning Commission is for a map amendment and not for a specific use or development at this time.

The applicant originally compared uses permitted in the existing industrial zone to uses permitted in the proposed commercial zone, then updated the traffic memo to also recognize that the property is also in the NE Gateway overlay zone that also already allows commercial uses (including restaurants) upon actions such as 15% or more expansion or redevelopment.

The applicant has compared uses as required by the Transportation Planning Rule to address “reasonable worst case scenario.” In addition to those uses analyzed for TPR compliance, a more intuitive example is that the NE Gateway Overlay, which already applies to the property, would already allow a restaurant through an expansion of 15% or more when compared to a restaurant use without expansion of the existing building that would be allowed by the proposed C-3 zoning.

As noted above, an “opening day” traffic analysis can also be required at the time of application of a specific use or development if it would exceed certain thresholds.

2. *Typo or poor sentence construction: P22, top line (delete the word “where” maybe?)*

STAFF RESPONSE: The intended meaning is, “The property is at a location which is well-suited to commercial use, with convenient access by walking, biking, and transit.”

3. *P25. Energy Conservation section. I think it is interesting that this narrative has NOTHING to do with energy usage really. Just the re-use of an existing structure is mentioned to “conserve” energy. I had noticed that the last general citywide planning documents included suggestions to include evaluations for solar energy. Can we add the suggestion in here, even if it not a mandate?*

STAFF RESPONSE: The request is for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Industrial to Commercial and a zone change from M-1 to C-3. This is not the kind of condition that would typically be applied to a map amendment for a property.

This would more appropriately be addressed through legislative standards or development of solar energy programs which would be consistently applied to properties. I would recommend this type of suggestion not be part of the formal motion for the decision, but instead conveyed to the applicant only on an informational basis.